







FROM THE  
PERSONAL LIBRARY OF  
JAMES BUELL MUNN

1890 - 1967

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

1309 v.2







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/memoirsoflifeadm02nare>

# MEMOIRS

OF THE

## LIFE AND ADMINISTRATION

OF

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

## WILLIAM CECIL, LORD BURGHLEY,

SECRETARY OF STATE IN THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD VI. AND  
LORD HIGH TREASURER OF ENGLAND IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

CONTAINING AN

### HISTORICAL VIEW

OF

THE TIMES IN WHICH HE LIVED,

AND OF THE MANY EMINENT AND ILLUSTRIOUS PERSONS WITH WHOM HE WAS CONNECTED;

WITH EXTRACTS FROM HIS PRIVATE AND OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE,

AND OTHER PAPERS,

NOW FIRST PUBLISHED FROM THE ORIGINALS.

BY THE

REV. EDWARD NARES, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

COLBURN AND BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET.

MDCCCXX.

R-B DA 358. B9N3  
100 20,3

TO  
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE  
WILLIAM ALLEYNE CECIL,  
**L O R D   B U R G H L E Y,**

(ELDEST SON OF THE MOST NOBLE  
BROWNLOW, MARQUESS OF EXETER, K.G.)

HEIR OF BURGHLEY,

AND THE IMMEDIATE AND DIRECT DESCENDANT  
OF THE  
VERY CELEBRATED STATESMAN WHOSE LIFE IS HEREIN RECORDED:

**This Second Volume of a Work**

DESIGNED TO COMMEMORATE WITHOUT FAVOUR OR FLATTERY

THE WISE COUNSELS,

INTENSE LABOURS, UNSHAKEN LOYALTY,

AND

FAITHFUL SERVICES OF HIS GREAT AND RENOWNED ANCESTOR,

IS

VERY RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY

THE AUTHOR.

*June 28, 1830.*





# CONTENTS.

## CHAP. I.

	Page
Accession of Elizabeth—Cecil's competency to advise the Queen—Her title to the Crown—Henry's Will—Description of the Queen's person—Cecil the first to announce to her Mary's demise, and her own accession—The Queen's first Council—Cecil Secretary—The Queen removes to London—Funerals of Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole—Bad state of England on Elizabeth's accession, from various Authors—Her Coronation—The Lord Keeper's Speech to Parliament—Assumption of the English Crown by Francis and Mary—Claims of the French in favour of Mary—Parliament meets—Courage of Elizabeth's Ministers—Philip II.'s proposal of Marriage—Device for Religion—The Queen on the Eucharist—Public Disputations—Cecil Chancellor of Cambridge—Peace of Chateau Cambrensis—Death of Henry II. of France—Danger to England from Scotland—Dangers from France—Revival of King Edward's Prayer Book—High Commission Court—Parker made Archbishop—Differences in Religion—Jewel's Letters on the State of England—Amendment of the Coin—Summary of wise counsels . . . . .	1

## CHAP. II.

Duke of Norfolk and Lord Grey sent to the North—Knox's Character—Alteration in the conduct and disposition of the Queen Regent of Scotland—Mary Queen of Scots' family the occasion of her troubles—Important Papers drawn up by Cecil on the aspect of affairs, particularly in regard to Scotland, with the conclusions drawn from them—Peace of Cambray, a fallacious peace—Maxims of defence—Lords of Congregation, their views—Lethington's famous Letter—Proceedings with Scotland, from Lord B.'s Notes—Lords of Congregation's Address to the Regent, with her reply—the Conquest of Scotland aimed at by France—Application of Protestants to Elizabeth—Elizabeth in danger of being beguiled—Account of Knox—Earl of Arran—Practices against England—Address to the Queen Regent from the Camp of the Confederates—Military operations in Scotland—Du Glasion, Spanish Minister, and Cecil's Answer to him in Latin—Duplicity of the French—Cook's Account of the English Ministers—Account of Monluc—Elizabeth's Proclamation against the Guises—Guises' notice of it—Spanish Interposition—

	Page
Papers by Knollys and Du Glasion—Intimation to Du Glasion of the Queen's Proceedings—Letters to Lady Cecil—Cecil sets off for Scotland—The Guises occupied with the conspiracy of Amboise—Letters from Cecil and Wotton—Progress of the Negotiation—Treaty of Edinburgh signed and proclaimed—Return of Cecil—Affairs of the Church—Lent season still observed—Archbishop Parker's order for serving the Cures—Cecil's Article . . . . .	84

### CHAP. III.

Death of Francis II. King of France—Perplexities of Elizabeth's title and competition with Mary of Scotland—Lord Burghley accused of deliberate enmity to Mary—His letter to Lord Shrewsbury—Elizabeth's title denied in France—Mary's principles and connexions alarming to the Protestants—Her intention to return to Scotland—Randolph sent to Scotland—Reflections and remarks on his Instructions—Missions of Murray and Leslie to France—Mary's passport refused—Scheme in France to detain Murray—Murray reported to have designs on the Crown—Throckmorton's account of Randon—Why Arran thought of by England—Possible causes for Mary's interception, if true—Her arrival in Scotland—Advantages over Elizabeth—Employs the Protestants on her return—Intercourse with Elizabeth—Desires to be acknowledged heir to Elizabeth—Refuses to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh—Cheney, a worthy but odd man, assisted by Cecil—The Queen visits the Secretary—The walking at Paul's stayed by Proclamation—Cecil made Master of the Court of Wards . . . . .	187
---	-----

### CHAP. IV.

Correspondence between the two Queens on the Treaty of Edinburgh—Dangers from the Guises—Knox and Conæus on the tyranny of the Guises—Necessity of examining into the conduct of the Catholics—Projected interview of the two Queens—Elizabeth ill—Mary of Scots anxious to have her title asserted—Cecil's letter to resign the Chancellorship of Cambridge—Situation of France at the accession of Charles IX.—Massacre of Vassi—Elizabeth assists the Hugonots—Confusion of parties—Throckmorton, Smith, Leicester, &c.—Shan O'Neale—Jewel's Apology—Death of Peter Martyr . . . . .	246
---	-----

### CHAP. V.

Parliamentary proceedings—The Speaker Williams' address to the Queen—Subsidy, and proceedings relative to the succession—Reflections on the Queen's marriage and succession—Nowell's catechism—Second Book of Homilies—Disputes in Convocation—Queen Elizabeth studies the Fathers—Conspiracy of the Poles—Surrender of Newhaven—Conclusion of the Council of Trent—Jewel's answer to Scipio—Osorius's letter to the Queen, and Haddon's answer—Haddon employed by Cecil—His death—Mary Queen of Scots writes to the council of Trent—Elizabeth's message to the Queen of Scots . . . . .	282
---	-----

## CHAP. VI.

	Page
<p>           Ills arising from Royal Marriages—Different Matrimonial Projects for Mary—Elizabeth proposes Leicester to her—Melvil sent on Matrimonial Embassies—Pictures—Duke Casimir—Archduke Charles—Conduct of Mary and Elizabeth with regard to Leicester—Return of Lennox to Scotland—Melvil's Account of Elizabeth and Dudley—Ceremony of his being made Earl of Leicester—Characters of Lord Burghley, Elizabeth, Mary, Darnley, Leicester, Archduke Charles, by Miss Aikin—Lord Burghley's Letter to Mundt—His Notes of the Proceedings of Scotland—Of Mary's Marriage with Darnley—Lord and Lady Lennox—Lord Darnley—Mr. Tamworth—Sir Francis Englefield's Letters—Duchess of Parma—Netherlands—Killegrew—Lines by Lady Killegrew—Lord Burghley's eldest Son married—Sir Thomas Chaloner's Death—Of Lord Burghley's concise Notes—Account of the Queen's visit to Cambridge—Her first visit to Kenilworth—Mayor of Coventry—Letter of John Fox—Hales' Book on the Succession—Lord Hertford and Lady Catherine Grey—Lord John Grey—Hales—Letters from Lady Catherine—Dennum's Letter—Puritans—Cartwright—Sampson and Humphrey—Bullinger—St. John's College, Cambridge—Lord Burghley appealed to in all Cases—Dispute between the Bishop of Winchester and Feckenham—Dominicus Sampsonius' Letter—Books sent to England by the Papists in Flanders—Protest of the People of Antwerp against the Court of Inquisition—Caryl—Letters to Lord Burghley—Dr. Goodman's Application—Strype on the Interview between Mary and Elizabeth . . . . .         </p>	312

## CHAP. VII.

<p>           Pope Pius V. chosen—Order of St. Michael sent to England—David Rizzio and Darnley—Murray—Randolph—Hazardous state of England—Character of the Scots—The Lennoxes—Randolph's letter—Marriage of Mary and Darnley—Protestant party low in Scotland—Copy of the Catholic league sent to Mary—Darnley and Mary on bad terms—Murder of Rizzio—Conæus upon it—Bothwell in favour—Birth of James—Melvil's mission to England—Elizabeth receives the news from Cecil—Account of Ruxby, Cecil's Spy—Cecil's letter to him—Ruxby's letter to Cecil—Rapin's correct account of things—Baptism of James VI.—Earl of Bedford sent by Elizabeth—Mary a dangerous rival at all times to Elizabeth—Bothwell in great favour—Darnley goes to Glasgow—Is sullen and not to be appeased—State of the Low Countries—Cardinal Granvelle very unpopular—Brabanters alarmed—The Queen visits Oxford—Parliament assembled—Proceedings about the succession—Parliament dissolved—Bull of Pope Pius V.—Account of Saravia . . . . .         </p>	363
--	-----

## CHAP. VIII.

	Page
Darnley's illness—Of Mary and Bothwell—Darnley's murder—Passage from Bishop Grindal's letter to Bullinger—Melvil's account of Mary, Darnley, and Bothwell—Of Mary's conduct towards Darnley—Bothwell's trial—Beton's letter to Mary—Mary carried to Bothwell's castle—Bothwell divorced—Mary marries him—Bothwell tries to get possession of the young Prince—Mary surrenders herself—Bothwell's flight—Throckmorton sent by Elizabeth—Mary's resignation—James crowned—Murray Regent—Fate of Bothwell—Overtures of marriage with the Archduke—Lord Sussex sent—Sir H. Sydney Lord Deputy of Ireland—Calais—Shan O'Niel—Confederacy of the Popish States—Articles of it—Incessant applications to Cecil—Attack on the Clergy—Dean Nowell—Dorman—Bishop Jewel—Attempt in Lancashire to restore Popery—Bishop of Carlisle—Faithful Cummin—Death of Dr. Nicholas Wotton—Queen's Progresses . . .	414

## CHAP. IX.

Various opinions as to what should be done with Mary—Knox—Different religious parties—Mary's escape from Lochleven—Conflict on Langside Hill—Mary flies to Dundrenan Abbey—Goes to Carlisle—Story of the ring—Of the difficult part Elizabeth had to act with regard to Mary—Of Mary's character—Difficulty of deciding what was best to be done with her—Elizabeth's conduct rashly judged by different authors—Lady Jane Grey—Comparison between Elizabeth and her sister Mary—Anne Boleyn—Sonnets, &c. produced at York—Murray's charges against Mary—Mary's letter to Elizabeth—Determination of Elizabeth and her Ministers to keep Mary in England—Sir Henry Norris's letter to Cecil—Letter from Mary to Elizabeth, from Bolton—Extract from the instructions of the Prince of Condé—Of Elizabeth and her Ministers, with regard to Mary—Of Elizabeth and Mary—Sir Ralph Sadler's speech—Of Elizabeth and her Counsellors, especially Lord Burghley—Commissioners meet at York—Queries sent to the Duke of Norfolk—Of the claim of England to a feudal superiority over Scotland—Queries favourable to Mary, suggested by the Council at Hampton Court—Sir Francis Knollys' letter to Elizabeth—Of Mary's situation—Letter from Lord Scrope and Sir F. Knollys concerning her—Of the Papists, in Lancashire especially—See of York vacant—Letter addressed by the Queen's order to Cecil, as Chancellor of Cambridge—Dr. Perne's Letter—Queen's illness—Sir John Mason's prayer—Of Mary's case—The Protestants of foreign countries seek the protection of Elizabeth—Many allowed to settle in England—The Pope's bull—Answered by Bishop Jewel—Affairs of the Netherlands—Count of Egmont—Anabaptists—Bishop Grindal—Cecil's Fast—Outrages committed by the Spaniards on the English Merchants' fleet—Paper presented to the Spanish Ambassador—On Fasting and Fish-days—Letter from Cecil to the University of Cambridge on Fasting—Queen's Progresses . . .	446
---	-----



CHAP. X.

	Page
Extract from Lord Burghley's Life, by a Domestic, containing the account of a Conspiracy against him, when Master of the Wards—Rapin's account of the same Conspiracy—Camden—Of the Queen's conduct in it—Extract from Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, relating to Cecil—Names of persons concerned in the Conspiracy—Of Lord Pembroke—Letters from the Earl of Sussex to Cecil—Of Leicester—Prayer in favour of the Queen's Marriage with the Archduke, attributed to Cecil—Of Cecil's views with regard to the Succession—Extract from Hallam, on the Conspiracy—Passage from Lord Burghley's Life, by a Domestic, with the account of a Papist's attempt to assassinate him—Rebellion in the North—Outrages on the Churches, &c.—The Priest Morton—Sir Thomas Smith's Pamphlet—Book attributed to Cecil by Strype—Illness of Cecil; his letters to Sir R. Sadler—Young Earl of Rutland—Duke of Norfolk—Memorial by Cecil, under the title of Perils and Remedies—Knox's letter to Wood—Passage from Rapin concerning Mary—Memorable Speech of Elizabeth, reported by Bishop Jewel—Montanus' History of the Spanish Inquisition published—Rodolphus Cavallerius—Theodore Wierus' letter to Cecil—Cecil's letter to Signor Bertano—Killegrew's letters to Cecil—Elizabeth excommunicated—Duke of Alva—Mary's charges against Elizabeth and Cecil—Extract from Strype concerning Mary—Her letter to Elizabeth from Tutbury Castle—Sir Walter Mildmay's opinion, in Burnet—Mr. White's account of Mary at Bolton—Lord Hunsdon's letter—Lord Shrewsbury's account of Mary's expenses—Letter from Cecil to Lord Shrewsbury—Letter from Lord Leicester to the Earl of Sussex—Sir N. Throckmorton's Conversation with the Earl of Lennox—Henry Carey sent to the Regent of Scotland with inquiries—Letter from Lords Huntingdon and Hereford to Cecil—Bishop of Ross—Admiral Coligni—Puritans—Christopher Foster's letter—Dr. Whitgift—Disturbances at Cambridge—Cecil appealed to in all cases—Death of Bishop Boner—Dr. Story—Douay College founded—Colleges at Rome—Persons—First Public Lottery . . . . .	489

CHAP. XI.

A year of extreme danger—Strype's abstract, with remarks upon it—Bullinger on the Pope's Bull—Bacon, Cecil, Mildmay and Sadler denounced as Evil Counsellors—Norfolk Rebellion—Wylson's Translation of Demosthenes dedicated to Lord Burghley—Cartwright excites disturbances—Opposition of the Puritans unreasonable—Lord Burghley as Chancellor of Cambridge much annoyed by them—Project of Marriage between Elizabeth and the Duc d'Anjou, afterwards Henry III.—Astrological calculations upon it—Death of the Regent Murray—Mission of Sir William Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmay to Mary Queen of Scots, at Chatsworth—Sir William Cecil made Lord Burghley—Bishop of Ross congratulates him—Cecil's own account of his new honours—Death of Throckmorton—Grindal, Archbishop of York . . . . .	518
--	-----

## CHAP. XII.

	Page
Dates puzzling—Marriage of the Queen revived—Walsingham sent—His instructions—Leicester and Burghley specially appointed to treat with the French minister—Sir Thomas Smith sent to Paris—Duplicity of both Courts—Scotch Commissioners—Leicester's account to Walsingham of the conference—Walsingham's answer—Of the part Cecil had to act in Mary's case—Duc d'Anjou—Ridolpho—Duke of Norfolk—Rapin's account of their plots—Intrigues against Elizabeth carried on by Mary with Spain and France—Bishop of Ross committed to custody—Lord Burghley's letter to Lord Shrewsbury—Spanish minister sent out of England—Design of the Spanish faction against the Queen's and Lord Burghley's life—Parliament meets—Debate on the succession—Bill passed making certain offences treasonable—Sir Thomas Smith—Death of Bishop Jewel—His Apology—Sir Francis Knollys—The Lord Keeper's Speech on the opening of Parliament—Of the great share Lord Burghley had in the good government of the kingdom—Affairs of the Church—Strype—Protestations—Leicester—Code of ecclesiastical and civil laws—Battle of Lepanto—Archbishop Parker—Lord Burghley's daughter married to Lord Oxford—Miss Aikin's character of Lord Oxford—Queen's Progresses—Theobalds . . .	548

## CHAP. XIII.

Treaty of peace with France—Intrigues against Elizabeth—Indictment and trial of the Duke of Norfolk—Execution of Mather and Berny for a Conspiracy against Lord Burghley—The Spanish faction much annoyed by the discovery—Death of the Marquis of Winchester, and Lord Burghley made Treasurer—Proceedings in Parliament against the Queen of Scots—Puritans busy—Seaton's Embassy—The Queen pressed by her Parliament to bring Mary to Trial—Letter of Lord Burghley to Sir F. Walsingham—Duke of Norfolk executed—League with France—Duke of Montmorency comes over—Cecil Knight of the Garter—Extract from Lord Burghley's Life, by a Domestic—Massacre of St. Bartholomew—Letters from Lord Burghley to Sir F. Walsingham on the Massacre; from Lord Leicester; and from Sir T. Smith—French Ambassador—Resentment manifested in England on account of the Massacre—Proposal of Catherine de Medicis to meet Elizabeth—Mason Fleur, the French Ambassador—Elizabeth requested to stand Godmother to the daughter of Charles IX.—Death of John Knox—Summary of Scotch affairs—Secret instructions to Killegrew on his being sent to Scotland—Lord Burghley's letters from Woodstock—Defence of Mary's honour—Comparison of Leslie and Buchanan—Disgrace of Mary—Detectio Mariæ—Intrigues of the Papists—Disciplinarians—Admonition to Parliament—Dering's Address—Archbishop Parker's Bible—Bishop Parkhurst—Extract from Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker—Queen's Progresses . . .	578
---	-----

# MEMOIRS

OF

## THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM CECIL, LORD BURGHLEY.

---

### CHAP. I.

First year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, from Nov. 17, 1558, to Nov. 16, 1559; first parliament met Jan. 25th, 1558-9, dissolved May 8th, 1559.

Anno Ferdinandi Imp. 4mo.—H. 2di R. Gall. 12mo. Mar. Reg. Scot. 16to. [*From Lord Burghley's own Notes of Queen Elizabeth's Reign.*]

---

*Accession of Elizabeth—Cecil's competency to advise the Queen—Her title to the Crown—Henry's Will—Description of the Queen's person—Cecil the first to announce to her Mary's demise, and her own accession—The Queen's first Council—Cecil Secretary—The Queen removes to London—Funerals of Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole—Bad state of England on Elizabeth's accession, from various Authors—Her Coronation—The Lord Keeper's Speech to Parliament—Assumption of the English Crown by Francis and Mary—Claims of the French in favour of Mary—Parliament meets—Courage of Elizabeth's Ministers—Philip II.'s proposal of Marriage—Device for Religion—The Queen on the Eucharist—Public Disputations—Cecil Chancellor of Cambridge—Peace of Chateau Cambrensis—Death of Henry II. of France—Danger to England from Scotland—Dangers from France—Revival of King Edward's Prayer Book—High Commission Court—Parker made Archbishop—Differences in Religion—Jewel's Letters on the State of England—Amendment of the Coin—Summary of wise counsels.*

WE are now arrived at the period, when, in the estimation of the generality of the world, the Political Life of the Great Man whose History we are writing, has been judged most properly to begin. On the accession to the throne of



that most extraordinary Sovereign and Mistress, \* whom, for the long space of Forty Years, and to the very termination of his natural life, he served with a constancy and fidelity impossible to be exceeded, and with such an unwearied attention to the preservation of her crown and her life, against a combination of foes, and with so rooted a regard to the glory, credit, and advancement of the kingdom she had to rule, as may be reasonably said to have laid the foundation of all that wealth and greatness, which have conspired to place it, for so long a course of time, in the first rank of the nations of the world.

Before we enter, however, into the transactions of this very extraordinary reign, we must, in justice to ourselves, submit to the reader the following remarks.

Had the Political Life of Lord Burghley begun, as many have appeared to think, with the accession of Elizabeth, we might be led to entertain very erroneous ideas of the extent of his wisdom, and the value of his services, at that very important period—a period, in which an occasion was most providentially supplied, by the demise of Mary, of revising all that had passed in the *three preceding Reigns*, as connected with that great revolutionary struggle, then on foot, between the Church of Rome, and the several reformed, or rather reforming Churches of Christendom; and which, as we have shewn in our first volume, had its beginning as nearly as could be at the very period of the commencement of the natural life of that eminent Statesman, and to which his attention happened to be powerfully drawn, before he can be said to have passed the season of his *youth*; having been entered very early† a member of the University of Cambridge, and at the very time, to use the words of a distinguished writer,‡ “when the last great revolution of the intellectual world was filling every academical mind with ardour or anxiety.” It was there he fell into the company of persons, in a high degree interested, if not immediately in the reformation of the Church, in the changes that were taking place conducive thereto; the emancipation of the human understanding from the trammels of a prescribed and mysterious course of study, and the cultivation of such particular branches of knowledge, as had heretofore met with no general encouragement, from a dread of the consequences to the usurped authority of the Papacy.

Nor could it have been possible for any young man, at such a time, to have fallen into a more *select* company than was the case with Lord Burghley,—there

\* Who has been described as “more than a man, and, in truth, sometimes less than a woman;” an expression attributed by some to Lord Burghley himself, by others, to his son Lord Salisbury.

† At 14 years of age.

‡ Dr. Johnson’s *Life of Ascham*.



being scarcely one of his academical associates, who did not afterwards become as conspicuous as himself, either in Church or State, and without any subsequent interruption of the acquaintance so early formed, except by death, notwithstanding the strange vicissitudes to which their native country became exposed.

When the sceptre passed into the hands of Elizabeth, no sovereign could be said to stand more in need, not merely of talented, but of *experienced* Counsellors; and Lord Burghley's had been, to say the least, as to all such purposes, a constant life of observation and experience;—experience collected at the fountain head, or derived through channels, the least devious that could be; personally known to her royal father, her brother, and her deceased sister, and to all those who had been their most confidential advisers and ministers, and never far absent from the very seat of government, who could be expected to know better than himself, what course should be determined upon in the very commencement of this new reign? There was no time to hesitate; the eyes of Europe could not but be directed from all parts towards England at this momentous crisis; her father, brother, and sister, had already drawn upon themselves general attention, but to the excitement of very different feelings towards their country; in the last reign, those who had taken the most conspicuous parts with her father and brother, in emancipating the nation from the usurped dominion of Rome, had been generally removed; many by death, many by banishment, and not a few by martyrdom. Lord Burghley stood almost alone as the survivor of the dead, and the representative of the absent; but in both cases the depositary of their most secret thoughts and wishes; he had witnessed the *undoing*, under Mary, of all that *they* had done, under Henry and Edward, some with the sacrifice of their lives, and others to the abandonment of their native country; and it seemed now in a great measure to rest with *him* to say, whether they were once more to have justice done them, by restoring the laws of Edward and Henry, which Mary had repealed, or to allow the Romanists to perpetuate the triumph they had, as it were, accidentally attained. No man could know better than himself, or more in detail, the history of these laws, and the important changes wrought and established by them; which history was therefore made the subject of our first volume, that the re-enactment of Edward's laws, and the re-establishment of the Protestant Church of England by Elizabeth, might be the easier understood. We endeavoured to impress it upon the reader's attention and memory at the beginning of this Memoir;—that the Life of Lord Burghley consisted principally of

two parts, the one of Observation, the other of Action. In the one he may be said to have been gathering knowledge, and establishing principles, in the other, applying them to the perfect emancipation of the kingdom from foreign dominion and foreign influence, as regarded both the Church and the State.

The History of the Reformation therefore in our first volume, will, it is hoped, be now discovered *not* to have been so much out of place as some have seemed to think. The *Work* of the Reformation may be said to have fallen on Elizabeth's *predecessors*, in every stage of which Lord Burghley may be considered as having borne his part; outliving many of the most eminent of his fellow-labourers, in that great field of revolutionary operations; we are now to view him in the character of the *Restorer* and *Preserver* of the Protestant Church and Protestant Government of England, the Upholder of the Protestant Interests in Scotland, and the principal promoter thereby of the final emancipation of that kingdom also, from the tyranny of Rome and machinations of foreign Catholic Powers, though not without one great and very melancholy sacrifice.

Sir William Cecil had now just completed his 38th year; his royal mistress, was thirteen years younger, having been born at Greenwich on the 7th of September 1533, in the 25th year of her father's reign. The circumstances of her birth had been most remarkable, if we take into account all that passed upon the occasion. Her father had been privately married to the Queen her mother, before the publication, at least, of the dissolution of his former marriage with Katherine of Aragon, and yet this could be no slur upon her legitimacy, if the grounds upon which that union was dissolved were correct. It has been too common to speak of Henry's separation from Katherine as a formal and legal divorce, but it could not be such, if the allegations on which it was founded were true, and in all instances correct; if the judgment of the Universities, affirming the marriage to have been so directly against the law of God, as to be beyond the reach of a papal dispensation, were sound,\* then must it have been null and void *ab initio*, and Henry was a free man, to marry whom he would. We are not overlooking (no person of common feeling we think could overlook) the hardships of Queen Katherine's case, or that of her then degraded daughter, the Princess Mary; but it seems quite certain, and there is

\* Burnet's "Abstract of those things which were written for the Divorce," in the first volume of his History of the Reformation, is exceedingly worth reading; especially by those who may be inclined to believe that the decisions were obtained by bribery, without due consideration of the actual merits of the case.

some necessity for saying so in this stage of our history, that Elizabeth, upon the very ground, on which her father was encouraged to part from Katherine, and notwithstanding all that followed, through the irregular passions, the cruelty, caprice, and despotism of Henry, supported by a corrupt and too submissive Court and Parliament, had a *just* right constantly to consider her *own birth* to have been legitimate. She had only to rest upon *these* points; that her father's marriage with Katherine of Aragon, his brother's widow, had been pronounced incestuous, as contrary to the laws of God,\* and consequently beyond the power of any papal dispensation, to render it good and valid.† That

\* The opinion of the University of Bologna is thus strongly expressed; "Censemus, judicamus, dicimus, constantissime testamur et indubie affirmamus, hujusmodi matrimonium, tales nuptias, tale conjugium horrendum fore, execrabile, detestandum, viroque Christiano, immo etiam cuilibet infideli prorsus abominabile, esseque a jure naturæ divino et humano diris pœnis prohibitum." *Burnet*, i. part ii. 143. The judgment of the University of Padua is very similar. Dr. Lingard supposes that all the judgments of the Universities depended upon the single point of the Queen's marriage with Arthur having been consummated, but this is not so. Collier, however, thinks it probable, ii. 54, 55. The judgments of the University of Paris, of Orleans, of Thoulouse, of Bologna, and Padua, have not that clause in them; "*sine liberis*," is the only expression used.—See *Burnet*, as before. This expression leaves no doubt, as Arthur certainly left no children, but after his death persons were appointed to attend upon Katherine, to ascertain whether she was pregnant or not.

† In the 12th ground of divorce, to be seen in *Burnet*, marked by Cranmer in his own handwriting, it is affirmed, "Henrici 8vo. Angliæ Regis invictissimi et serenissimæ Catharinæ prætensum matrimonium lege Divina et naturali prohibente, nullum omnino fuisse neque esse posse censemus."—*Burnet*, i. part ii. 149; see also the sentence of divorce, No. XLVII. It would be difficult to shew, that the dispensation itself did not prove the connexion to be incestuous; for though the Popes, to support their own claims to a general interference, had constituted themselves the judges of all cases of affinity, and degrees of kindred, within which marriage was not to be contracted, yet it might reasonably be inquired, upon what ground the marriage with a brother's widow should stand *prohibited*, and consequently *require a dispensation*, except as being contrary to some law of *God* or *nature*. She had indeed the stronger right to question the dispensation, because, how anxiously soever the Catholics have sought to cast the blame of Henry's separation from Katherine, on the Reformers, most certain it is, that there were more Catholics than Protestants concerned in it; it is almost enough to mention, that to the petition of the Parliament to the Pope, to grant the divorce, besides the two Archbishops, four Bishops, and twenty-four Abbots, were among those who signed it.

Katherine's declaration of her virginity has something in it very questionable; and if Henry's character were pure, we have undoubtedly his counter-declaration.—See *Turner's Henry VIII.* p. 513, note 41, compare page 552. Nothing seems more difficult to overcome on the part of Katherine, than the alleged suspense and doubt manifested at Court, on the death of Arthur, in regard to her being left pregnant or not.



it was therefore null *ab initio*, and that her father, upon the discovery of its perfect illegality, had a just right, if not a conscientious plea, to separate himself from her, without those *tedious*, *tiresome*, and *disgusting* formalities, to which Henry's last remnant of respect for the court of Rome induced him for a long time to submit, in order to give it the appearance of a regular divorce. Elizabeth could be under no necessity of believing the story of her mother's guilt, or of her precontract with the Lord Percy, for they are not credited to this day, by any persons capable of investigating that portion of the English history without prejudice; and as to her subsequent illegitimation by Parliament at the *will* of *Henry*, she had certainly no need to attend to that, if she discredited the allegations on which it was founded. At the period of her birth, it is exceedingly notorious that her father took every step he could take to mark his own sense of her legitimacy,\* by the magnificent circumstances attending her christening, † and his investing her with the *title* of Princess of Wales, upon the alleged illegitimacy of her elder sister.

Her elevation to the throne upon the death of Mary, did not indeed depend, as we shall soon shew, upon any of these questions, but simply on the will of her father; the legitimacy of her birth, nevertheless, was of the highest importance as a bar against the pretensions of other living competitors, who might reasonably be allowed to dispute the power of a will, to overrule claims more decidedly hereditary, in favour of a notoriously spurious offspring. The course of succession had hitherto been as follows; First, *Edward*, as the undoubted

\* Sanders indeed asserts, that Henry had declared in Parliament, that she was not and could not be his daughter; but see how he is answered by Burnet, Collection of Records, vol. ii. part ii. Appendix, p. 80. Lingard insists that Anne Boleyn alluded to Henry's connexion with her sister, rather than her precontract with Lord Percy, to favour the divorce.—See *Henry VIII.* vol. vi. page 322. compare *Turner*, 623.

† For an account of this extraordinary ceremony, see Holinshed, Nichols's Progresses, and Aikin's Court of Elizabeth. This last writer dwells largely on the melancholy ends to which most of the exalted personages, who bore a part in this gorgeous and magnificent piece of pageantry, were brought; few of the company having failed afterwards to become the victims, either of the jealousy and cruelty of their capricious Master, or of the struggles produced by the Reformation of religion. The same writer notices a circumstance, which, according to the superstitious credulity of the age, has been supposed to have been the influential cause of that extraordinary sympathy, which gave such power and weight to the unworthy Leicester, in the Court of this otherwise just discernor of men's talents. This "bold bad man," as he has been called, was said to have been born on the same day and at the same hour as the Princess herself. After the death of her mother, at only three years of age, a Table of State was projected for her.—See Lady Margaret Brian's Letter to Cromwell, and Thompson's Court of Henry VIII. ii. 555, 6.

male heir of Henry VIII., and consequently, independently of the will, upon the fair ground of legitimate inheritance: next, *Mary*; at one time universally regarded also as the legitimate offspring of Henry, but afterwards set aside as illegitimate, upon a question never more than partially resolved, though perhaps rightly resolved by those, who, after having determined the marriage with a brother's widow to be contrary to the law of God, disputed the Pope's power to dispense with such laws. These decisions it must be admitted, were never received or allowed by the Catholic party, as just and right;\* *Mary*, therefore, as a *Catholic*, might *also* to the hour of her death, very fairly have looked upon her own birth to have been legitimate, and to have had, as much as her brother, an hereditary claim to the crown, as well as a right by her father's will; but on the accession of Elizabeth, the validity of those decisions may be said to have operated exactly as much in *her* favour with the whole *Protestant* party, as their invalidity had operated in favour of *Mary*, amongst the Romanists during the preceding reign. Elizabeth, therefore, as an anti-Romanist, had an equal right to look upon her own birth as legitimate:—and thus, both these Princesses, as well as their unhappy and unfortunate mothers, may with much reason, as far as regarded themselves personally and individually, be said to stand clear of all those stains and taints of infamy, with which their several connexions with Henry and the crown of England, have since been branded. As Catholics, Katherine of Aragon and *Mary* her daughter, had the plea of a papal dispensation in their favour, which, if valid, as they must be allowed to have felt it to be, neither the caprice of Henry, nor even the power of a British parliament, could in *their* estimation invalidate. Elizabeth, on the contrary, had on her side, as it must appear now, a still stronger plea, of the utter invalidity of a papal bull, to render a marriage lawful, which had been contracted in violation of, or in opposition to, the revealed word of God.

The reader, as we proceed in the history of the extraordinary reign we have now entered upon, will see the reasons for our touching upon these points so particularly. Elizabeth seems to us, we must confess, to have been not only “full royally born,” but as royally *educated*; which in itself deserves to be considered as no trifling proof or confirmation of the former.

\* With the exception, it should be observed, of Francis I., who, in the most formal manner possible, admitted Henry's marriage with Katherine to be incestuous, and her offspring by him spurious, and his marriage with Anne to be consequently valid and good, and Elizabeth entirely legitimate.—See *Burnet's Records*, vol. iii. No. XXXVI.

As to the early extraordinary attainments of this renowned Princess, we conceive them to be authenticated by the most indisputable evidences of history. Proofs indeed are not wanting at this moment, to establish the fact beyond all power of contradiction; we have still preserved in her own hand-writing, specimens of her learning and ready talents, beyond the ordinary accomplishments of the female sex, and which cannot, we should think fail, to excite surprise and admiration in all who may have the means of access to them. Camden's account of her, certainly savours somewhat of extravagance, though not in all points. He describes her, as "of admirable beauty, and well deserving a crown; of a modest gravity, excellent wit, royal soul, happy memory, and indefatigably given to the study of learning, insomuch as before she was seventeen years of age, she understood well the Latin, French, and Italian tongues,\* and had an indifferent knowledge of the Greek; neither did she neglect music, so far as it became a princess, being able to sing sweetly and play handsomely on the lute."

Though this be the evidence of a contemporary, and one who knew her well, and Camden's account seems to be corroborated by Sir Richard Baker, another contemporary, who uses exactly the same words, yet her "admirable beauty" remains questionable.† That she well "deserved a crown" is true; if magnanimity and resolution; a wise choice of counsellors; defiance of enemies; regard for the honour, and care for the security, wealth, and prosperity of her subjects, be the proper tests of such qualifications. Her "modest gravity" was not so constant

\* Ascham and Huentius add *Spanish*. She used to translate from the French, but her *pronunciation* of the latter language seems not to have been generally approved by *foreigners*; as that tell-tale Bayle has been careful to inform us, in his multifarious but entertaining notes from *du Maurier's Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de Hollande*. From the Latin she translated many works, as is well known, and several from the Greek. For a full account of the literary productions of Elizabeth, see Parke's edition of Walpole's Royal and Noble Authors, and the Preface to Nichols's Progresses.

† A remarkable difference of opinion seems to have prevailed in regard to her complexion. Naunton says it was *fair*; Bohun that her skin was of *pure white*; but Michele, the Venetian ambassador, who had probably frequent opportunities of seeing her, and wrote of her in his dispatches to the Senate, describes her to have been "*olivastra in complexionem*," of an olive or dark complexion. (See *Lingard*.) But in the report, as it is to be seen in Mr. Ellis's Second Series of Original Letters, the words of the original being "*di bella carne enchorche olivatra*," it is rendered, "her complexion fine though rather sallow." This paper of Michele is extremely curious, and we are much indebted to Mr. Ellis for the pains he has taken to make it intelligible to the public in his entertaining and valuable publication.



and habitual as to secure her, by all accounts, from occasional bursts of passion and anger, highly unbecoming her sex and station; nor was her "excellent wit," always so pure and chaste and feminine as might have been expected from one in so high and elevated a condition of life; her "royal soul," if it were such politically, which seems to have been the case in a great abundance of instances, was certainly deficient in some princely virtues, and not so softened by refinement of manners as might have been wished. To what has been said of her literary attainments we have already expressed our assent. The famous Roger Ascham, the fellow-collegian and friend of Sir William Cecil, and public orator at Cambridge, became, after Grindal, her principal preceptor; and it is well known how triumphantly, in his "Schoolmaster," a work expressly addressed to Sir William, he challenged, or defied, all "the young gentlemen of England," nay all "the prebendaries of the church," to match his "one mayd," in "excellencie of learning and knowledge of divers tongues."

It is certainly very extraordinary, that with these great talents, and attainments beyond her sex, and with such strong traits in her character, Elizabeth should have borne her faculties so meekly\* during the three preceding reigns, as to arrive at this momentous period of her life, with so little embarrassment in regard to her succession, that her sister was scarcely deceased, before the event was communicated to both Houses of Parliament, by Hethe, Archbishop of York,§ Lord Chancellor, and her accession announced at the same time, as "the true, lawfull, and right inheritrice to the crown;" to use the Archbishop's own words, as cited by Holinshed. "Scarce had he spoken the word," says Camden, "when all from all sides cried and recried, *God save Queen Elizabeth, Reign she most long, Reign she most happily.*" Nor was there any time lost, in publicly proclaiming her title, with all the accustomed solemnities, both in London and Westminster, in the presence not only of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and other civic authorities, but of many of the first nobility, and magistracy of the realm; a deputation of the Council being at the same time appointed to attend upon her Majesty, to communicate the proceedings that had already taken place, and receive her commands.

\* Her amiable brother Edward VI., as is well known, gave her a name which certainly bespoke such meekness of character:—he was used to call her, his "Sweet Sister *Temperance.*"

† Bishop of *Ely* (Aikin); but the Bishop of Ely at that time was Thirleby, who was engaged in an embassy abroad.

At this time Elizabeth had her residence at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, a place of her own, it having been made over to her in the year 1550 by her brother Edward VI., as parcel of the lands belonging to the Bishoprick of Ely, and hence called Hatfield *Episcopi sive Regis*.\* It had been indeed prescribed to her, as her settled abode, by her sister Mary, not long after her release from imprisonment at Woodstock, in the year 1555; and she had been consigned, while there, to the special care of Sir Thomas Pope, a gentleman of singular worth and integrity, well inclined indeed, not only to shew respect to his royal charge, and occasionally to enliven the dull hours of her comparative seclusion from the world, but to connive at her retaining about her person many sincere Protestants; to the great discomfiture of *Gardiner*, who did not hesitate to exert his power with Mary to have some of them removed; some even of the Princess's chief favourites. At this period, indeed, Elizabeth seems undoubtedly to have stood upon better terms with her *sister*, than had previously been the case; she had even received from her the gift of a valuable ring, as a positive token of a perfect reconciliation; and, in the spring of the year 1557, Mary had paid the Princess a visit at Hatfield, on which occasion she was, by the care, and too much at the private expense of Sir Thomas Pope, most royally entertained, with much music, dramatic exhibitions, and bear-baiting, the fashionable amusements of the day. This visit appears to have so well satisfied Mary, as to have induced her to give in return, an entertainment, to the Princess and her suite, at Richmond, not altogether so costly, yet very magnificent.

It has been conjectured that the Queen's cordiality towards her sister at this period was occasioned by some jealousy she had conceived of her absent husband, King Philip, who was supposed to have been captivated by the charms of the Duchess of Lorraine; and whom, in conjunction with the Duchess of Parma, he had incautiously sent to England to prevail upon Elizabeth to marry the Duke of Savoy; a step the Queen so warmly resented, as absolutely to prohibit their resort to Hatfield for that purpose.

Whatever may have been the actual state of things, amidst such a perplexity of views and feelings, it seems to be certain, that Hatfield House had for the last three years, been to Elizabeth a more agreeable and peaceful residence than any she had enjoyed before. She had a large but reasonable

\* It is scarcely necessary to observe, that it is now the seat of the the Marquess of Salisbury, the lineal descendant of Lord Burghley. James the First gave it to the first *Earl* of Salisbury in exchange for *Theobalds*; of which we shall have more to say.



establishment; she lived unsuspected; and under the superintendence of Sir Thomas Pope, the Founder of Trinity College, Oxford,\* she had been able to indulge her taste for classical literature, and for such studies, as, though generally accounted above her sex, were in those days known to confer distinction on many ladies connected with the Court.

It was in this her peaceful retirement, comparatively so at least, considering the suspicions under which she had previously laboured,† that this illustrious Princess received the first intimation of her sister's demise, and of her own accession to the Crown; and it is generally supposed to have been communicated to her by Lord Burghley, in a *particular spot*, in the grounds of Hatfield House, pointed out, we believe, to all casual visitors of that princely residence, to this very day.

On the 17th day of November, in the year 1558, it was that Lord Burghley had to announce to Elizabeth the momentous event, not only of Mary's death, but of *her* being received, acknowledged, and proclaimed the lawful successor of her deceased sister;‡ from which instant, to the hour of his death, forty years afterwards, he may very justly be said to have been her chief and most confidential adviser, counsellor, and minister. He was, indeed, as we have observed, fully competent to be so; no man could know better than he did, all that had been passing in the preceding reigns; no man could better know the real interests of England, and the situation in which the new Sove-

\* Fuller, in his Church History, speaking of Sir Thomas, says, "I find this Mr. Pope," (as then unknighthed) "a principal visitor at the dissolution of Abbeys. Now as none were losers employed in that service, so we find few refunding back to charitable uses; and perchance this man alone the *thankful Samaritan* who made a publique acknowledgment."

† Naunton, speaking of her condition under her sister Mary, says, "It was resolved and her destinie decreed to set her an apprentice in the schoole of affliction, and to draw her through that ordeal fire of tryall, the better to mould and fashion her to rule and sovereigntie; which finished, and Fortune calling to minde that the time of her servitude was expired, gave up her indentures, and therewithall delivered into her custodie, a sceptre as the reward of her service."

‡ The following is the account we find in Naunton's *Fragmenta Regalia*, of the way in which she received the intelligence: "Being then at Hatfield, and under a guard, and the parliament sitting at the self-same time; at the news of the Queen's death, and her own proclamation by the general consent of the House, and the publick sufferance of the people; falling on her knees, after a good time of respiration, she uttered this verse of the Psalm, "*A Domino factum est illud, et est mirabile in oculis nostris;*" This is the Lord's work, and it is wonderful in our eyes. And we find it to this day on the stamp of her *gold*, and *this* on her *silver* coin: "Posui Deum adiutorem meum;" I have chosen God for my help.

reign was placed, with regard, as well to the several parties at home, as to all neighbouring or foreign Powers.\* We may reasonably consider him to have become, by this time, a consummate politician, and to have known all the bearings of the politics, not of England only, but of Europe—politics, embracing not merely civil, but ecclesiastical questions, never before brought to so decisive a trial and issue. He now stood at the right hand of the new Sovereign of England, to give her the whole benefit of that knowledge and experience, and she did not hesitate, by her early call upon him, to acknowledge that such were her expectations. It was rather as an old than a new servant that she now recognized him; he received, indeed, as an eminent writer has observed, the first honour she had to confer, as Queen, and became the first avowed Counsellor she ever had; in fact, the very speech she is reported to have made to the deputation sent by the Council to wait on her at Hatfield, is said to have been prepared and written by Lord Burghley;† and, it is very certain, that the minute of steps to be taken on her first elevation to the throne, was drawn up by him; in which there is undoubtedly such a compactness of expression, and such an extent of observation, as must be allowed to bespeak no common talents in a person of Lord Burghley's age. It is still preserved in the valuable collection of Cottonian Manuscripts in the British Museum, Titus, c. x. 21. to the following effect.

I. To consider the Proclamation, and to proclaim it, and to send the same to all manner of places and Sheriffs, with speed, and to print it.

II. To prepare the Tower, and to appoint the custody thereof to trusty persons; and to write to all the keepers of forts and castles in the Queen's name.

III. To consider for the removing to the Tower, and the Queen there to settle her officers and Council.

\* *Voltaire* could discover the *necessity*, in order to become properly acquainted with the life and reign of Elizabeth, [of tracing matters back to the times of her predecessors.—*General History*, part v. ch. xiii. But another foreign writer has gone much farther in estimating the amount of knowledge requisite to a right understanding of the reign of Elizabeth. “*L'histoire d'Elisabeth*,” says *Mademoiselle Keralio*, “liée à celle de plusieurs royaumes, demandoit une connoissance generale de l'histoire d'Ecosse, d'Irlande, de France, d'Espagne, des Pays-Bas, et de quelques points de l'histoire ecclesiastique.”—She might have said even more than this.

† Dr. Lingard calls this “a formal and studied discourse.” We shall not dispute it; it could scarcely have been otherwise. Let us consider the alternative. Had there been no form and no study displayed, could it have been suitable to the occasion?—Her Majesty, we happen to know, could have spoken for herself, extempore; but on such an occasion, and according to the custom of Courts, a little form and study, if we grant the charge, could not surely have been out of place.

IV. To make a stay of passages to all the ports until a certain day ; and to consider the situation of all places dangerous towards France and Scotland, especially in this charge.

V. To send special messengers to the Pope, Emperor, the Kings of Spain and Denmark, and to the State of Venice.

VI. To send new Commissioners to the Earl of Arundel and Bishop of Ely, (*who were treating a peace at Cambray ;*) and to send one into Ireland with a new commission ; and letters under the Queen's hand to all Ambassadors with foreign Princes to authorize them therein.

VII. To appoint Commissioners for the interment of the late Queen.

VIII. To appoint Commissioners for the Coronation, and the day.

IX. To make a continuance of the Term, with patents to the Chief Justice, to the Lord Treasurer, Justices of each Bench, Barons, and Masters of the Rolls, with inhibition, *Quod non conferant aliquod officium.*

X. To appoint new Sheriffs and Justices of the Peace, or continue the old, by a Proclamation to be sent to the Sheriffs under the Great Seal.

XI. To inhibit by Proclamation the making over of any money by exchange, without knowledge given to the Queen's Majesty, and to charge all manner of persons that either have made any, or have been privy to any exchange made, by the space of one month before the 17th of this month.

XII. To consider the preacher of Paul's Cross, that no occasion be given by him to stir any dispute touching the governance of the Realm.

But the account of these things, as we find it in Lord Burghley's Life by a Domestic, must not be omitted: "When Quene Elizabeth, beganne her most happie reign, Sir *William Cecill*, for his truth and *tried service* to her, was worthely called and honourably advanced by her Majestie to be her Secretarie and Counsellor, and was first sworne of anie Counsellor she had at *Hatfield*, where she laie at her first coming to her Crowne, wherein he then beganne to kindle the light, that ever since gave light and life to this State. Her Majesties Christian princely care and inclination concurring with his wise and provident counsell, tooke then rooting, to roote out popery and superstition, and to plante the practise and profession of the Gospel in this realme, and the peaceable platform of government, we nowe enjoye in this state, with so happie peaceable and plentifull successe as for so long a tyme of government, so famous exploits and so manie notable things happeninge in the tyme of her Majesties reigne, are more admirable in this age than matchable in former, in all the nations of Christen-



dome ; which beganne and contynued first by Godes goodnes, and her Majesties godly princely care and providence, was also not a little furered and perfected by his pollicie, paines, and contynuall carefull counsell, never slacking the service, nor loosinge the opportunitie, ever esteeming his greatest paines his greatest pleasure, to please his prince and pleasure his contrie.”

The Queen did not remove from Hatfield till after she had established a new Council ; and in order that her first measures, notwithstanding the rigorous proceedings of the last reign, might appear conciliatory rather than repulsive, she determined to retain no fewer than thirteen of her sister's Council, all of them reputed Catholics ;\* adding to them, as Camden says, “ with a certain moderation and temperance according to the respect of the times,” only eight of her own, or the *reformed* party. The *thirteen* Counsellors retained, were Hethe, Archbishop of York, the Marquess of Winchester, Lord Treasurer ; the Earls of Arundel, Shrewsbury, Derby, and Pembroke ; the Lord Clinton (Lord Admiral), William Lord Howard of Effingham (Lord Chamberlain), Sir Thomas Cheynie,† Sir William Petre, Sir John Mason, Sir Richard Sackville, and Dr. Nicholas Wotton, Dean of Canterbury.

The *eight* added to the above, and who were held to be all of the reformed party, were the Marquess of Northampton, the Earl of Bedford,‡ Sir Thomas

\* Rapin and others call them *zealous* Catholics. This does certainly not apply to all. Mr. Hallam, in his *Constitutional History of England*, says, “ Her Council was formed of a *very few* Catholics, of several pliant conformists with all changes, and of some known friends to the Protestant interests.”

† Sir Thomas Cheynie died shortly after in the Tower of London. We have already had occasion to notice the splendid establishment of this worthy Knight (see vol. i. p. 16.) ; though by some oversight he is there called Sir John. Holinshed's account of him is certainly very curious : “ For 20 years before he died he kept in his stable winter and summer 20 great horse at the least, and 8 or 9 geldings, besides 16 or 17 kept at grass. The number of the servants to whom he gave liveries was 205, and he paid them all great wages quarterly, fed them with plenty of good meat and drink, and allowed them “ good featherbeds ” to sleep upon ; to all he left either annuities or a whole year's wages, and made provision that till they got other employment they should have an allowance of meat and drink at his house. He had been brought up in Henry the VIIth's house ; and had therefore before he died served three Kings and two Queens, chiefly in the office of Treasurer of the Household, which he held at the time of his death, being besides Warden of the Cinque Ports. He was one that had had the honour of justing with King Henry VIII. and of being overthrown by his Majesty.”

‡ For an account of the Marquess of Northampton and the Earl of Bedford, see Lloyd's *State Worthies*. Lloyd asserts, that the Marquess of Northampton, the Earl of Bedford, and Sir Wil-

Parry,\* Sir Edward Rogers, Sir Ambrose Cave,† Sir Francis Knolles, Sir William CECIL, and Sir Nicholas Bacon; the latter (who, by his second marriage with one of the celebrated daughters of Sir Anthony Cooke, stood in the relationship of brother-in-law to Sir William) being made Keeper of the Great Seal, and Sir William himself, (“a man of excellent wisdom, and one of a thousand,” as an old writer calls him, upon the occasion of this appointment,) Secretary of State.‡

The author of the “*Nugæ Antiquæ*,” records it as a fact, that the Queen on appointing him one of her Council, addressed him to the following effect :

“I give you this charge, that you shall be of my privy-council, and content yourself to take pains for me and my realm. *This judgment I have of you*, that you will not be corrupted with any gift, and that you will be faithful to the state, and that, without respect of my private will, you will give me that counsel that you think best: and that if you shall know any thing necessary to be declared to me of secresy, you shall shew it to myself only, and assure yourself I will not fail to keep taciturnity therein. And therefore herewith I charge you.”

We may now see of what importance it probably was, to the revived cause of the Reformation, that the two relatives, Bacon and Cecil, should have remained in

liam Cecil, were the only persons to whom the Queen communicated her design of Reformation, and correcting the Common Prayer; and they ordered affairs so, that the Protestants should be in hope, and yet the Papists should not be out of hope.

\* “His (Sir Thomas Parry’s) family,” says Lodge, “had been connected with that of Secretary Cecil, by an inter-marriage of a very remote date, and that Minister (Cecil) of whose pains to discover, and conscientious readiness to acknowledge, even his most distant relations, I have many original proofs in my possession, probably introduced him to Elizabeth, in whose service he had been for some years.”

† Sir Ambrose Cave was a native of Stamford, a great friend of Cecil’s, whose eldest sister Margaret married into the family. It may be looked upon, perhaps, as rather a compliment to the talents, characters, and principles of the new Counsellors, that they should be thus stigmatised in the famous Bull of Pius V. deposing Elizabeth, 1569; speaking of her first proceedings on her accession, it states, that the new Queen “*Regium Consilium ex Anglicâ Nobilitate confectum dirimit* (which however was not true), *illudque obscuris hominibus Hæreticis complevit*.”—*Burnet, Records*, ii. B. iii. No. XIII.

‡ The author of the *Memoirs of Lord Burghley*, speaking of the Council, says, “The Privy Council, by the recommendation of *Cecil*, was composed of *loyal Papists*, and *moderate Protestants*.”—Mary’s two Secretaries, who were now removed, were *Bourn* and *Boxal*. Sir William Petre, was made joint Secretary with Cecil.

England, during the short reign of Mary. The thirteen Catholic Counsellors, were well known to both, nor could it be unknown to either, that most of them had complied with all the changes which were made in the national religion since the latter end of Henry's reign, and were such adepts in the fashionable art of adapting their principles to the visible complexion of the times,\* as to present no great hindrances to a fresh revolution.†

While the Queen remained at Hatfield she sat in Council every day, after its first appointment, which took place on the 20th of November. On the 23d, she took her journey towards London, with a large attendance of Lords, Knights, Gentlemen, and Ladies, with all their servants and trains, a special summons having been sent to assemble them upon the occasion.‡ On her first arrival in London, she took up her abode at the Lord North's in the Charter House, or dissolved *Monastery* of the *Chartreux*, where she remained till the 28th, sitting, as before, in Council every day.

On the 28th her Majesty passed in great state from the Charter House to the Tower; the streets being new gravelled for the purpose; the Lord Mayor carried her sceptre, and the Earl of Pembroke the sword of state. The Queen herself rode on horseback, in a sumptuous dress of purple velvet, and behind her, as her Master of Horse, the famous Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of

\* See Warton's *Life of Sir Thomas Pope*.

† That Sir William looked forward from the first to another change, is to be collected from a curious letter preserved among the Burghley MSS. from Sir Richard Shelley, and to be seen in Strype, (*Annals*, i. 261.) in which he reminds Lord Burghley (as he then was) of an answer he had given in his (Sir J. Shelley's) hearing to Lord Paget, and which had made a great impression on his mind. Lord Paget it seems having observed to Cecil that Queen Mary had returned the realm wholly Catholic, the latter rather eagerly answered, My Lord, you are therein so far deceived that I fear rather an inundation of the contrary part, so universal a boiling and bubbling I see of some stomachs that cannot yet digest the crudity of that time. That Lord Burghley might reasonably calculate on the practicability of a fresh change, seems to be sufficiently proved by the reports extant of the effect the Queen's accession had upon the holders of Church preferment. There are some differences in the estimates recorded, but it is pretty generally believed that of 9,400 beneficed clergy, only 177 relinquished their preferment, out of attachment to the Roman See.

‡ The summons bears date November 21, 1558. It was sent by Sir Ralph Sadler, and has the signatures of the Earl of Pembroke, Sir Thomas Parry, Lord Clinton, Lord Howard, Sir Edward Rogers, Sir William Cecil, and Sir Ambrose Cave.—See *Strype's Annals*, vol. i. part ii. no. 11. where may be also seen the names of the noblemen who were summoned to attend. Burnet mistakes the day of her removal.—See *Lodge*, i. 301.



Leicester; the trumpets sounding, and guns firing all the way. Many speeches also being addressed to her by children at different places, according to the fashion of the times.

We cannot forbear copying upon this occasion the following just remarks, by the author of the Court of Queen Elizabeth: "With what vivid and what affecting impressions of the vicissitudes attending on the great must she have passed again within the antique walls of that fortress, once her dungeon, now her palace! She had entered it by the traitors' gate, a terrified and defenceless prisoner, smarting under many wrongs, hopeless of deliverance, and apprehending nothing less than an ignominious death. She had quitted it still a captive, under the guard of armed men, to be conducted she knew not whither. She returned to it in all the pomp of royalty, surrounded by the ministers of her power, ushered by the applauses of her people; the cherished object of every eye, the idol of every heart."\*

At the Tower she *appears* to have continued (for there is, as usual, a great discordancy of dates) till the 5th of December; on which day she is said to have removed to Somerset House in the Strand; there she rested again till the 23d of the same month, when she finally came to Westminster, where the Parliament was to hold its sitting, and where she kept her Christmas. This last removal to Westminster was attended with circumstances very gratifying to the Queen, because, though very much in the adulatory style, they were probably at bottom sincere; but as we shall have to speak of similar pageantries and compliments, on occasion of the Coronation, we shall at present rather notice the solemnities attending the funeral of Queen Mary, which took place ten days before the Queen came to Westminster, that is to say, on the 13th of December. It was conducted with much royal state and ceremony, an image resembling the deceased Sovereign, being, according to the custom of those times, placed on the chariot or hearse, covered with crimson velvet, the crown on its head, and sceptre in its hand, and many costly rings on its fingers.

\* The same writer notices also the following curious circumstance: "Elizabeth was attended on her passage to the Tower by one who, like herself, returned with honour to that place of his former captivity; but not, like herself, with a mind disciplined by adversity, to receive with moderation and wisdom 'the good vicissitude of joy.' This person was Lord Robert Dudley, whom the Queen had thus early encouraged to aspire to her future favours, by appointing him to the office of her Master of the Horse." He was not long after made Knight of the Garter, though disqualified by having been attainted of treason in the former reign; so that it was necessary to make a new decree to remove that stain.—See *Ashmole*, and the *Life of Leicester*, 1727.

One thing occurred to disturb the solemnities of the day. Bishop White, having to preach the funeral sermon, inveighed so strongly against the return of the Protestant fugitives, as to venture to assert, that whosoever should kill them, would do a deed acceptable to God; "*Bonum factum si quis exules reduces interfecerit.*" Jewel, in a letter to Peter Martyr, calls it, "*Insanam et turbulentissimam concionem.*" The text was curiously chosen, "I praised the dead more than the living." Burnet, however, who saw a copy of it, says, he had put into it some decent words of the Queen.—See the Sermon itself in Strype's Memorials, iii. part ii. catalogue, no. lxxxii.

On the day in which the ceremonies of Queen Mary's funeral began, the remains of Cardinal Pole were conveyed from Lambeth to Canterbury, and buried there; two Bishops, Pate of Worcester, and Goldwell of St. Asaph (his ancient friends and the faithful companions of his long exile), being specially permitted to attend the body, and to officiate in the service; the one in English and the other in Latin, as it has been asserted. Elizabeth and Cecil seem to have been very desirous of shewing respect to the deceased Cardinal, both in the ordering of his funeral, and in assisting his executor the Signior Prioli, to recover all debts and arrears due to him. The statute of Philip and Mary, repealing the act of attainder of the Cardinal, in the 31st year of the reign of King Henry VIII. was also confirmed. No small proofs that they were under *some obligations* to the Cardinal during the late reign, and possibly for *protection*, otherwise nobody had done more, in his contest with Henry, to alienate the regard of Elizabeth, touching the conduct both of her father and mother. We shall always believe, as we have intimated in our first volume, that Cecil had an influence with the Cardinal, friendly to the cause of the Reformation, or at least to the liberal principles of Protestantism, and the protection of the Princess Elizabeth. Strype (*Annals*, i. 72.) concludes that the letter written to the Queen, by the Cardinal before his death, and sent to her by his Chaplain, was intended to "satisfy her that he was in none of the faction against her life and reign," and he conceives that the message accompanying the letter, was to persuade her to continue the Roman Religion. It might be so, but the purport of the *letter* is all we have to do with.

Three weeks had now nearly elapsed since Elizabeth had been proclaimed Queen, and as almost as many councils had been holden as days had passed, we may conclude that many measures had been adopted in conformity with the minute presented to the Queen at Hatfield, by Cecil; dispatches were sent to all



her Ambassadors abroad, to announce her accession to the Crown, as having devolved to her by direct inheritance, or, as the expression in her proclamation runs, "as the only right heir by blood, and lawful succession."

We have already shewn, that she had a fair right to *consider herself* to have been the right heir by *blood*; for though she had been bastardized by act of Parliament in her father's lifetime, and virtually bastardized a second time, by the act that restored Mary, and pronounced *her* mother's marriage with Henry to be valid, notwithstanding all former acts and processes; yet as her immediate predecessor had been allowed the benefit of a legislative enactment, to annul all that Henry had accomplished to invalidate his union with Katherine, Elizabeth had surely as great a right to regard that union as incestuous, and out of the protection of a papal dispensation; which would of course render her father's marriage with her mother, Queen Anne, lawful and good.\* We do not mean to say, that the disturbances that had taken place, in regard to both marriages, were without effect upon the less disputable claims of others connected with the Crown; we are only endeavouring to prove, that if Elizabeth chose to insist upon her legitimacy as giving her a nearer claim by blood, than the descendants or representatives of Henry's sisters, she had a right to do it; her legitimacy in the eyes of a large proportion of her subjects, was at the least as certain as the legitimacy of Mary (which the Romanists in the last reign had taken upon them to re-assert), could be in the eyes of another portion of her subjects; her "lawful succession,"† might nevertheless, in stricter terms, be referred to Henry's will.

\* It should be recollected that Mary herself had pronounced her mother's marriage with Henry to be incestuous. Speaking of Elizabeth's professing to be a Catholic in the preceding reign, "yet did not Queen Mary believe her," says Camden; "remembering that she herself in the like fear, had by letters, written with her own hand (which I myself have seen), not only for ever renounced the Pope's authority in England, but also acknowledged her father to be Supreme Head of the Church under Christ, and her mother's marriage with King Henry to have been incestuous and unlawful."—*Camden's Introduction*. See also Mary's own letters to her *father*, and one to *Cromwell*, containing a full submission to the King's pleasure, in all the points of religion.—*Burnet's History of the Reformation*, vol. ii. Collection of Records, book ii. numbers iii. iv. v. vi.

† It has been thought very strange that Elizabeth never caused the sentence of her mother's divorce, and the subsequent act declaring herself illegitimate, to be annulled; and Camden, Burnet, Rapin, &c. have attempted to assign reasons for this. May not the true cause have been, that knowing as she did that her father's will being founded on an act of Parliament, gave her a statutable and therefore legal right to the throne, and feeling in herself that she had reason sufficient to account herself legitimate, notwithstanding Henry's capricious proceedings, she

It was certainly, however, a fortunate circumstance for Elizabeth, as far as regarded the consent of her subjects generally, to her advancement to the Crown, that those who might have claimed it clear of all those disturbances to which we have alluded, were not in a situation to render their pretensions either agreeable or safe to the nation, nor universally desirable to the Continental Powers. Mary, Queen of Scotland, the descendant of Henry's elder sister, had been just married to the Dauphin, heir to the French Crown; a connexion little likely to be favourable to the rights, liberties, and independence of England, and very objectionable to Philip, should she be able thereby to add England to Scotland, and both to France. While Frances, Duchess of Suffolk, the descendant of Henry's younger sister, could have no family claim before the Queen of Scotland, but in virtue of Henry's last will, which gave the Crown to Elizabeth before her. To have brought her forward, therefore, in such palpable competition with two more direct claimants, could scarcely have failed to excite a civil war from one extremity of the island to the other. Nor was the Duchess of Suffolk at all in a situation to produce an interest in her favour. Since the execution of the Duke her husband, she had re-married with a Commoner, and one much below her; a young man, Adrian Stoakes, who held the situation of Master of her Horse.\*

might not like to have recourse to an expedient, which if valid in her own case, would have been valid in the case of her predecessor, who had caused such acts against her own legitimacy to *be repealed*, for if the repeal of the act of Mary's illegitimacy could make *her* legitimate, then Elizabeth's actual legitimacy founded on the absolute nullity of Henry's marriage with Katherine, would have been overthrown. It was very consistent with the magnanimity of her character to despise such acts. Rapin says, "Dr. Burnet thinks the conduct of this Parliament (the first of Elizabeth) equally pious and wise; I allow the first, but the continued endeavours to dethrone Elizabeth, wholly founded on the sentence of her mother's divorce, and the subsequent act, will not permit me to believe it wisdom to leave them unrepealed." We have stated why we think otherwise.—See also Camden, and what Burnet says upon it in his *History of the Reformation*, vol. i. 376, 7. And after all, one act that was passed seems to have been a good deal overlooked; we mean the act by which Elizabeth was "restored in blood to the late Queen Anne her Highness's mother."—See *Strype's Annals*, i. part ii. 398. This must surely have been virtually an annulment of her illegitimacy, on the mother's side, and consequently on her father's side, though the latter might be kept out of sight for the reasons above.

\* There is a tradition, that on Elizabeth exclaiming with surprise and indignation when the news of this connexion reached her ears, "What, hath she married her Horse Keeper?" Cecil replied, "Yes, Madam, and she says your Majesty would like to do so too:"—Lord Robert Dudley then filling the office of Master of the Horse to the Queen. It is certainly very remarkable, and has

Elizabeth, therefore, had certainly nothing to deter her from opening her intercourse and communications with foreign Powers, upon a footing of perfect equality as the Sovereign of a free, independent, and powerful kingdom; reduced in strength, certainly, by the disastrous politics of the last reign, but in no manner sunk in her own estimation of the extent of her resources under a more prudent and wise administration, or in the spirit of the people to resist oppression.

And, indeed, there was great cause immediately to consider the actual amount of such resources, as well as the call that might speedily be made on the spirit of the people to support their new Sovereign from hostile attempts. Many accounts are to be seen in our histories of the alarming posture and aspect of affairs at the period of the demise of Mary. The following is to be found in Mallet's Life of Sir Nicholas Bacon, which we the more willingly copy, because it is the chief object of that publication to shew, how all the difficulties he enumerates were overcome afterwards, by the prudent, but vigorous measures of a Government, in which the two relatives, *Cecil* and *Bacon*, are known to have borne so great a share.\*

"At her (Elizabeth's) accession to the throne," says this author, "she found her revenues anticipated or exhausted; her kingdom, through the sanguinary madness of her predecessor, disjointed and broken of its vigour within; at the same time, unsupported by allies, and without consideration abroad.—She found the nation four millions in debt; a sum then almost incredible. Her navy was fallen into decay and almost abandoned—and she was associated in a war against the power of France and Scotland."

The observant author of the Memoirs of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, published in 1738, takes nearly the same view of things in the following terms:

been noticed as a proof of the spuriousness of Henry's will, that, in passing over his two nieces, Frances and Eleanor, and giving the Crown to their heirs before them, the son of Adrian Stoakes would have inherited the Crown before his mother.—See *Secret Memoirs of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, p. 169.

\* Voltaire has given us a pretty fair account of the state of Europe, about this period, in the following terms: "After the reign of Charles V.," he observes, "*four* great Powers constituted the balance of power in Christendom; *Spain*, by its treasures in the New World; *France*, by itself and by its situation, which hindered the communication between the vast dominions of Philip II.; *Germany*, by the multitude of its princes, who, though divided among themselves, were united for the defence of their country; *England*, after the death of Mary, by the political conduct of Queen Elizabeth only, for its dominions were no great matter; Scotland, instead of forming a compact body with it, was its enemy, and Ireland a burthen."



“ At home, the *nation* was greatly *disturbed*, though not *disaffected*, the minds of men being much *heated* in matters of *religion*; those of the *Popish* fearing, those of the *Protestant* expecting an alteration; the generality harassed with *taxes*, and little inclined to submit even to necessary *impositions*; the treasures of the Crown exhausted, the Crown itself in debt, and mightily dishonoured by the late feeble administration, the loss of *Calais*, and the weak management of foreign affairs; abroad, many *enemies*, without one *sincere ally*; France favouring the title of *Mary* Queen of *Scots*, and secretly intending, under colour thereof, to attack *England* by the way of *Scotland*; *Spain* jealous, the *Emperor* lukewarm, the *Pope* outrageous; the nearer states of *Europe* in their conduct doubtful, those more remote, indifferent; trade much decayed, and the *English* coin scandalously debased: in a word, *without*, a gloomy prospect of impending danger; *within*, heart-burnings and divisions, a naked land, and an impoverished people.”

We cannot be expected to omit what follows, as it evidently proceeds from the pen of a powerful writer, and no mean judge, of the subject he handles.

“ As Sir William Cecil,” he proceeds, “ directed the Queen’s councils *before* *he was her counsellor*, and was admitted to that high office in the *first* council she held, so without the least interval of coldness, he continued in her confidence as long as he lived; being her sole oracle in State, as Sir Nicholas Bacon was in Law.”

The most authentic and public account of the state of the nation indeed, is of course to be looked for in the speech of the eminent person just named, in his first address to the parliament, and delivered in the Queen’s presence; but before we proceed to speak of the parliament, we ought perhaps to give some account of the Coronation which was appointed, according to the VIIIth Article in the minute of Sir William, a few days before the meeting of that assembly. The latter being fixed for the 23d of January (adjourned afterwards to the 25th), and the Coronation for the 15th of the same month.

Though the Queen was to be crowned in the abbey church at Westminster, as usual upon such solemn occasions, yet to add to the magnificence of the ceremony, it was judged right that she should previously pass from her palace in Westminster, to the royal apartments in the Tower, which would afford her an opportunity of returning afterwards through the whole town, and exhibiting herself more generally to the eager multitude. The streets at that time being narrow and ill-paved, the Thames was, as has been well observed,

the great thoroughfare of the metropolis. The royal palaces, and mansions of the nobility, being, for this very purpose, situated on its banks; three days before the coronation therefore, namely, on the 12th of January, the state barges of the corporation and city companies, highly ornamented, having repaired to Whitehall, to attend her Majesty, she was conveyed from thence with great state, to the Tower of London, a large attendance of royal barges having joined those of the city.

Two days after, she took her passage back to Westminster through the town in her carriage, with an immense accompaniment of Lords and Ladies, all nicely apparelled in crimson velvet, and their horses covered with the same. The streets were gravelled, the conduits new painted and highly beautified, and pageants set up in abundance of places to salute her as she passed. Music and firing of guns adding much to the triumph of the day. Her Majesty's patience and hardihood of constitution must certainly have been great, to have enabled her, in the cold month of January, to bear with any appearance of delight, the many stops and interruptions she met with, from the multiplicity of pageants and devices, where she was obliged to listen, in almost endless succession, to the poetical rhapsodies composed for the occasion, and bear her part in the allegorical exhibitions prepared to do her honour.\* It has been common to notice one of these in particular, as having a connexion with the Reformation of Religion, and of the disposition of the citizens at this time, notwithstanding the persecutions of the last reign. From a cave beneath one of the pageants, in which the eight beatitudes were exhibited, and so managed, as severally to

\* It would be needless to attempt to describe all that passed upon this occasion, the curious reader may find enough to amuse, if not to weary him, in Nichols and Holinshed, who have been careful to preserve all the verses that were spoken at the different resting places. One thing seems certain, that the young Queen knew well how to humour and gratify the enthusiasm of the multitude, by a great mixture of affability and dignity, suitable to the occasion, and which shews her to have been, when she chose it, as Collier says, 'a great mistress of behaviour.' At 25 years of age, after every allowance for flattery, to which she became subsequently a dupe, we may easily suppose, from the many portraits remaining of her, and the descriptions to be read of her, that her personal appearance must have been such, as to set her off greatly to the admiration of a populace, disposed to be pleased with their new Queen. Bohun and Naunton represent her to have been possessed of great beauty; Camden's account of her has been given; but there can be no doubt of the royal dignity she very early learnt to assume, and which, softened by a great courtesy of manners, on all public occasions, must have been a very captivating, and conducive to her popularity.

bear some application to her Majesty, a figure of *Time*, with his scythe and wings came forth, accompanied by a young person clad in white silk, to represent his *daughter*, *Truth*; the latter holding in her hand an *English* Bible, which she offered to the Queen's acceptance. Elizabeth received the present as it was intended, kissed it as the true *Verbum Veritatis*,\* declared she would often and repeatedly peruse it, and holding up both her hands, returned thanks, with remarkable solemnity, to the devisers of so choice a gift, and so appropriate an emblem. It was on the succeeding day, January 15th,† 1558-9, that she was at length solemnly crowned, by Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle; the rest of the bench, with Hethe at their head, refusing to assist at the ceremony; partly through distrust of the Queen's intentions; partly out of tenderness to the threatened cause of Romanism,—the Queen having already forbidden Oglethorpe to elevate the host, and allowed the reading of the English service; and finally, because they judged, that if Oglethorpe had refused, without the hands of a Bishop she could not have been Queen.‡ During this ceremony, and at one of the most important parts of it, the Secretary appears to have been placed particularly nigh to the Queen's person; since in the account to be seen in the Ashmolean Museum, when the Queen approached the "aulter," where "kussyns (cushions) of gold" were placed for her use, we read that "*Secretary Cycill*, delivered a booke to the Busshop, and there was a Bysshop § standing at the left hand of the aulter."

\* It is rather singular that her predecessor, Queen Mary, should have used a seal, whereon, under her figure on horseback, were these words, "*Temporis Filia Veritas*," and on her coins, was a representation, as Sandford writes, of "*Winged Time* drawing *Truth* out of a well;" and he adds that she bore this motto by persuasion of the Clergy. When a Bible was presented to Mary Queen of Scots, among the pageantries at Edinburgh, she is reported to have exhibited marks of displeasure.—*Knox*.

† Collier has it January 14th, but that was the day on which she proceeded from the Tower to Westminster, which day, by an odd mistake in Murdin, is marked in Lord Burghley's own notes as January 4th; this must certainly be a misprint. Burnet says, she returned from the Tower on the 13th, having gone there on the 12th; this is wrong, she stayed two days at the Tower, and returned on the 14th.

‡ On the proclamation of her title, she was declared to be, not simply Defender of the Faith, but "*Defender of the trewe, ancient, and Catholic Faithe*," which had some meaning in it.

§ It might be difficult to say who this Bishop was, as, according to Collier, Hethe and the rest of that order absented themselves, while the Protestant Bishops, Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale, lay under a sentence of deprivation. The service was certainly performed according to the ancient custom, and directed by the Roman Pontifical, but without any elevation of the host.



According to the IVth, Vth, and VIth Articles of Sir William's celebrated Memorial, presented to the Queen at Hatfield, it had been proposed, "to consider the safety of all places dangerous towards France and Scotland; especially in this change.—To send special messengers to the Pope, Emperor, the Kings of Spain and Denmark, and to the state of Venice.—To send new powers to the Earl of Arundel and Bishop of Ely (who were then treating a peace at Cambray), and to send one into Ireland, with a new commission, and letters under the Queen's hands, to all Ambassadors with foreign Princes, to authorise them therein."

All these things appear to have obtained immediate attention, so that before the meeting of Parliament, and even before the Coronation, we find from Lord Burghley's own memorandums, that on the 23d of November, the very day the Queen quitted Hatfield, Lord Cobham was sent to the Low Countries, to the King of Spain (Philip being absent at the time of Mary's demise), and that he carried with him a new commission and instructions to the Earl of Arundel, Bishop of Ely, and Dr. Wotton.\* That on the 26th, Sir Thomas

There had been no time yet for the repealing Mary's laws, which had repealed those of Henry and Edward; what passed therefore was rather a compliance with the *laws*, than the religion, and may perhaps be regarded, as some excuse for the compliance Elizabeth would afterwards have insisted on with respect to her own laws, before the principles of legal toleration were anywhere properly understood. Burnet, in his notes upon Sanders, has remarked upon the clemency of the Queen, in not immediately dismissing the Bishops who had refused to crown her. Hethe, indeed, was often kindly noticed by her after his deprivation. Mr. Butler, however, considers their behaviour at this time to have been highly correct and loyal, because they did not oppose the Coronation after their refusal to crown her. They did homage, and only sighed and submitted when they saw her break her coronation oath.—*Book of the R. C. Church*, 224-5. It is however extremely certain that many popish zealots, unrestrained by the Bishops, preached against Elizabeth's legitimacy, and in abuse of her mother, favouring and advancing the title of the Queen of Scots.

\* In Strype's Annals, i. 37 and 49, (Oxford edition, 1816,) it is said and repeated, that Elizabeth sent over the Earl of Arundel, Lord Chamberlain, to join the other Commissioners; but, Lord Arundel was there already, as not only Camden and others write, but as is proved by a dispatch from Flanders to the Council, dated Nov. 18th, 1558, the very day after Mary died, and which has his signature. It was the Lord Howard of Effingham, who was sent to assist the other commissioners, and who actually was Lord Chamberlain at the time, which indeed Strype also notices, p. 48; so that the mistake is very evident. Rapin says, Lord Howard of Effingham was sent, but takes no notice of Lord Arundel as a commissioner. Collier says, Lord Howard of Effingham, was (with Lord Cobham) furnished with powers to go on with the treaty of Cambray. (Vol. ii. 410.) But Lord Cobham, though he carried indeed fresh powers, Nov. 23,

Chaloner was sent to the Emperor Ferdinand, being at Cambray, and that on the 14th of Dec. the day immediately preceding the Coronation, Lord Thomas Howard was dispatched as commissioner into the Low Countries, to join with Dr. Wotton at Cercamp. Killegrew went to the Protestant Princes in Germany; Karne,\* who had continued at Rome in the management of affairs since the death of Edward VI. had orders to notify to the Pope, Mary's death, and the accession of Elizabeth to the throne; and similar notifications were sent to the courts of Sweden and Denmark. France and Scotland, no doubt, required the greatest attention; and though there was a peace negotiating, no part of Sir William's Memorial could require to be more attended to, than what related to the defence and protection of the kingdom from these two foes; immediately, therefore, on the Queen's accession, orders were sent out to the Vice-Admiral to keep the sea, and watch Calais; the state of the ordnance in the Tower was diligently inquired into, as well as the state of Portsmouth and the other strong places on the coast.

But the actual degree of danger may be best understood, as well as the means of providing against it, from a paper drawn up by Secretary Cecil, after his accustomed manner, as a guide to the Council, upon a pretty

seems rather to have been sent on a special embassy to Philip. Lastly, Lord Burghley's own notes in Murdin, shew not only that Lord Arundel was there, or supposed to be there, with the Bishop of Ely and Dr. Wotton, at the period of the Queen's accession, but that Lord Howard was dispatched thither as a commissioner, to join them at Cercamp on the 14th of December. Dr. Lingard says, Lord Arundel came home on Mary's death, and this is the exact truth; as may be seen by the instructions given to the Lord Howard of Effingham, and printed in Forbes, vol. i. p. 36; so that, though Lord Arundel was one of the original commissioners, his unexpected return gave occasion to the sending of Lord Howard.

\* As to Karne's notification of her accession to the Pope, Dr. Lingard writes, "His ear, (i. e. the Pope's) had been preoccupied by the diligence of the French Ambassador, who suggested that to admit the succession of Elizabeth, would be to approve the pretended marriage of her parents, Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn; to annul the decisions of Clement VII. and Paul III.; to pre-judge the claim of the true and legitimate heir, Mary Queen of Scots; and to offend the King of France, who had determined to support the right of his daughter-in-law with all the power of his realm. The Pope therefore told Karne plainly, that he was unable to comprehend the hereditary right of one who was not born in lawful wedlock." Dr. L. has not added, but which seems to be quite true, that the Pope indignantly observed, that Elizabeth had been very bold to take the Crown and name of Queen without his leave, in a kingdom holden in *fee of the Church*.—*Juricu's History of the Council of Trent*; *Dic. Historique*, art. *Paul IV.* The Abbé Millot's observation upon this is "On s' imagine être au siècle du Roi Jean et d' Innocent III."



general belief and opinion, that France contemplated no less than the conquest of England this very year. "First," he argues, "they would not defer it because of the *doubt* of the Queen (of Scots') life. Secondly, they had now got an occasion to conquer Scotland, and had already men of war there, and prepared a great army both out of France and Almain. Their captains were appointed; their victuals provided; their ships in rigging. Thirdly, they reckoned within a month to have their wills in Scotland. Fourthly, that done, it seemed most likely they would prosecute their pretence against England; which had no fort but Berwick to stay them, and that was imperfect, and would be these two years' day. Fifthly, if they offered battle with Almain, there was great doubt how England would be able to sustain it; both for lack of good generals and great captains; and principally for lack of people, considering the waste that had lately been by sickness and death these three last years; again, if it were defended with strangers, the entertainment would be so chargeable in respect of money, and so hurtful to the realm, as it could not be borne." These questions were then propounded. First, what to do; next, whether it were better to impeach the enemy in Scotland, now in the beginning, before their army were come; and so to take away their landing places: or to permit them therein, and to provide for the defence of the realm.

The course suggested to be taken was principally this. "First, that the Queen's Majesty did with speed send to King Philip to understand his mind, and to obtain his friendship. *Item*, that one be sent to the King of Denmark, to stay him, and to cause him to doubt of the French. *Item*, to send to the Princes of Almain. *Item*, to provide all manner of ways for money, armour, &c. *Item*, to send to the French King, to declare to him what occasions the Queen hath to doubt of his proceedings; and therefore, to let him know her purpose of defence, and that if his proceedings increased as they were begun her Majesty must needs proceed to prevent the dangers."

And upon this it was moved (we follow Strype), that Sir Nicholas Throgmorton should be dispatched to France.\*

\* This was the same who underwent the extraordinary trial we have spoken of, in the last reign, for a concern in Wyatt's insurrection, and who had nobly and generously withstood the attempts that were made, to implicate, through his evidence, the Princess Elizabeth and the Earl of Devonshire. His trial, which is to be seen at length in Holinshed, is allowedly one of the most interesting documents of that nature, extant.

This beginning of things is sufficient to shew, as in former instances, where the greatest danger lay, and how entirely necessary it was, in the very first instance, to direct the views of the Council and Government towards Scotland, as the “stepping stone” of France;\* to find some pretence for keeping a fleet in those parts, to hinder the landing of fresh succours, which were known to be ready to be sent from French ports, for the purpose, first, of bringing Scotland into subjection to the will of France, and then invading England—and with what intent? no doubt, to set Mary Queen of Scots on the English throne, depose Elizabeth, maintain the Catholic Religion, and reduce the whole island of Britain to a state of abject dependence on France. To protect his Sovereign and his country from these fatal calamities, we do very confidently believe to have been the end and scope of all Lord Burghley’s practices in regard to Scotland; and, we have the more reason to dwell upon it here, because his great care has been misconstrued and misrepresented to so great a degree, as to be referred entirely to a rooted malignity of heart, altogether incredible, and extending in its consequences through a series of many years. We shall be under the necessity of telling a long story, one which, if we could suppose that any unprejudiced readers would regard it as altogether a *digression* from the work we have in hand, we should very gladly omit.

Mr. Chalmers, in his History of Mary Queen of Scots, conceives that he has discovered proofs of Cecil’s inveterate disposition to work *her* individual ruin, by his mode of collecting charges against her, from the first moment that he was called to power under Elizabeth; and that he was busy (“very frequent,” is Mr. Chalmers’s expression), in “noticing *transgressions on her part*, for the obvious purpose of constant recollection:” and he would insinuate that he began almost before any offence could be given.†

\* “She received the kingdom at the hand of her sister, entangled (I will not say oppressed) with foreign wars: the French on one side, and the Scots on the other; which, sucking out of their ancestors’ poisoned breasts immortal and deadly hatred against this realm, lay in wait like thieves to invade and spoil it.”—*Aylmers’ Harbrough for faithful subjects, &c.*—A coarse and inelegant, but certainly, a very true description. What passed in Henry and Edward’s days, as related in our first volume, seemed now about to be revenged upon England, by advancing Mary’s claim to the throne, against Elizabeth, and invading the latter country by way of Scotland.

† The state of things is thus given. Mr. Chalmers observes, that there was published at Paris, in 1548 (it should be 1558), a declaration of the triumphant marriage of the two most noble Prince and Princess, Francis de Valois, and Mary Stuart, by the Grace of God, King and Queen of Scotland, and Dauphin and Dauphiness of France. “We may thus perceive,” says

The case is this—In the notes on Queen Elizabeth's reign, by the Lord Treasurer Burghley, to be found in Murdin's Collections of Papers at Hatfield-House, we find these entries :

"Jan. 16. (that is, 1558-9) the Dolphin of France and his Wife Queen of Scotts did, by the style of King and Queen of Scotland, *England* and *Ireland*, graunt to the Lord Fleming certain things, &c.

"June 28, (1559) the justs at Paris, wherein the King Dolphins two Heralds were appareld with the arms of *England* and Scotland.

"July 11, (1559) this day consultation for the French Kings stile and arms for *England* to be joined with France.

"July 16. Ushers going before the Queen of Scotts (being now the French Queen)\* to the Chappell, cry, *Place pour la Reine d'Angleterre*.

Mr. Chalmers, "that the assumption of *the titles of England*, which was never forgiven, must have taken place somewhat later. It was on the 16th of January, 1558-9, that Cecil took notice in his Diary, for the first time, that the Dauphin and Dauphiness did grant something to Lord Fleming, by the style of King and Queen of Scotland, England, and Ireland." All this is very true, probably, but it only makes the case the stronger in favour of Cecil. Mary was married on the 24th day of April, 1558; yet, as he truly says, there appears to have been then *no assumption of the titles of England*: but, according to Lord Burghley, on the 16th of January, 1558-9, there was; that is, just two months, and no more, after Mary of England's death and Elizabeth's accession. Can we doubt, therefore, whether the first assumption of those titles was not in direct opposition to *Elizabeth*, to her *Protestant* principles, and in token of a distrust of the validity of *her* title to the English Crown?—Nothing, we think, could have been more obvious; and Cecil's memorandum, therefore, bespeaks his discernment, and attention to the danger of Elizabeth, under a disputed title. The French meddled not with *Mary's* title, though the Queen of Scots had just as strong claims against her, on the ground of a parliamentary exclusion in her father's reign. When put, afterwards, into the line of succession by Henry's will, Elizabeth was restored also, as equally the King's daughter, the two divorces remaining as they were. All these things made the assumption of the arms a direct insult to Elizabeth; it was impossible to regard it as any thing less. Not that *this* was, after all, the *first* step taken towards her exclusion: we know, from the letters that passed, and are preserved, between Henry II. and Antoine de Noailles, his ambassador here in 1553, that as soon as ever Katherine's divorce was repealed by Parliament, and Mary again legitimated, Henry regarded it as so direct a bastardy of Elizabeth, as to put Mary Queen of Scots next in the line of inheritance. And, therefore, it is very wisely observed by Vertot, in a note upon the passage, "*Cette pretention causa depuis tous les malheurs de cette infortunée Princesse*." What could the assumption of the arms then in 1558 be, but a direct *renewal* of this pretension, not by "ushers and poets," but by Kings and Ministers?—*Negociations de Noailles*, ii. 250.

\* July 26th, tidings came to London that the young French King had proclaimed himself King of France, Scotland, and England.—*Strype's Annals*, i. 289.



“ July 27. The armes of the Scot. Queen was set upon certeyn arches at the marriadge solemnized for the King of Spain, with the French Kings daughter, with the armes of England, with these verses underneath in Scottish :

“ The armes of Mary Queen Dolphin of France,  
The noblest Lady on Earth for till avance,  
Of Scotland Queen and England too,  
Of Ireland too, as God has provided so.\*

“ Nov. In this month the Queen of Scotts made her entry into Chattelleraut, where her stile was published as Queen of England, where four verses were made, whereof the two last were :

“ Nunc Gallos totoque remotos orbe Britannos,  
Unum Dos Mariæ cogit in Imperium.”

Here are altogether six entries in the course of one year, and that the first of the Queen's reign ; a good many certainly for the mere purpose of recollection,† and that recollection kept up and encouraged with no other view than to work the ruin, in time, of a young woman of only sixteen years of age ; to which end, we are to suppose, he was “eager to collect against her matters of charge,” though she was at the same moment “admired in France for the principles of her heart, and the qualities of her head.” And, adds the same author, “it was not, it seems, inquired how far the Scottish Queen partook in the impertinences

\* The arms were borne *Baron* and *Femme*. In the first was the coat of the Dauphin of France, which took up the upper part of the shield ; the lower half contained the arms of Scotland. This impaled quarterly. 1. The arms of Scotland. 2. The arms of England. The 3d. as the 2d. The 4th as the 1st. *Over all, half an escutcheon of pretence of England ; the sinister half being, as it were, obscured or cut off.* “Perhaps so given,” says Strype, “to denote that another (and who should that be but Queen Elizabeth), had gotten possession of the Crown in her prejudice. One of these escutcheons being brought out of France and delivered to the Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshal, he referred it to the heralds, who found the same to be “prejudicial to the Queen's Majesty, her state, and dignity.” Their decision may be seen in Strype's *Annals*, i. p. 12. “Hence,” says Camden, p. 34. “flowed, as from a fountain, all the calamities wherein she (Mary) was afterwards wrapped.”—It was absurd to pretend that the arms were now assumed merely to denote the affinity. Mary's father, who was nearer to the Crown of England, never bore them ; (*Forbes*, i. 350.) nor Mary herself, while the sister of Elizabeth reigned.

† In the despatches from Killegrew and Jones, (Blois, 29th November, 1559) addressed to the Queen, and to be seen in *Forbes*, i. 266, &c. a more particular account of these things may be read.



of ushers, or in the imprudence of poets, when those offerings were made at the shrine of Vanity.”\*

Can this be called writing history? We should scarcely have thought it possible that any man in his senses could suppose, that at so momentous a period, so eminent a statesman as Sir William Cecil, should record such transactions, if by any construction they could be regarded as merely arising out of the impertinencies of ushers, or the imprudence of poets, making offerings at the shrine of Vanity. We can forgive any writer for deploring the unhappy end of Mary Queen of Scots, but to fix upon such memorandums as we have cited, as indelible proofs of a malignity of heart in *Lord Burghley*,† tending to her destruction (as many as 30 years afterwards), is in itself little less than a proof of a prejudice altogether as malignant, against Lord Burghley, on the part of the historian.‡ And yet thus have the minds of readers generally been pre-

\* It is asserted in the paper entitled *Responsio ad Petitiones D. Glasion, &c.*, drawn up by Cecil, that Mary called herself Queen of England and Ireland, and denied Elizabeth’s right.—See *Forbes*, vol. i. 404. (20.) This is one of the best papers upon the subject, extant. But, of Mr. Chalmers’ idea of Elizabeth’s *right*, we may form a good idea, from his remarks on the treaty of Edinburgh, to be spoken of hereafter; where he plainly alleges that the *recital* of that treaty, affirming that the kingdoms of England and Ireland did, by *right*, pertain to Elizabeth, threw the Scottish Queen too much in the wrong when she assumed the title of Queen of England and Ireland.

† We do not wish to speak rudely of Mr. Chalmers, but it seems a point of indispensable necessity, to caution the reader of a life of Lord Burghley, against what the author of the *Biographica Britannica* calls that “literary Quixotism,” which has been manifested within our own memory, in defence of the character of Mary, at the expense of Elizabeth and her ministers; particularly Lord Burghley, as the text may shew.—See *Biog. Brit.* art. *Buchanan*, note 5. Mr. Hallam, in his *Constitutional History of England*, sub Reg. Elizabeth, writes, “We may well avoid the tedious and intricate paths of Scottish history, where each fact must be sustained by a controversial discussion.” Happy should we be if we could say the same, but there is scarcely one controverted fact of that perplexed history, in which as well the private character as the public fame of the great man whose life we are writing, is not deeply implicated.

‡ It is astonishing how this author is bent upon vilifying Elizabeth and Cecil in almost every page of his work, but especially the latter. In the eyes of Mr. Chalmers, all his wisdom was wickedness; his whole policy, perfidy and deceit; his acts atrocious, his heart malignant, and all his designs fraught with mischief. Had we felt that in undertaking this work, we should have nothing to do but to wash such a blackmoor white (to use a vulgar but very significant expression) we should have turned from it in disgust; but when we had looked thoroughly into the character of the times in which Cecil lived, and considered whom and what he had to defend, we discovered so much wicked wisdom, so much perfidy and deceit, such atrocious, malignant,

occupied against Elizabeth and her counsellors, by the advocates of the unhappy Queen of Scots. In the posture of affairs, to which Lord Burghley's attention must have been directed, during the first twelve months of Elizabeth's reign, perhaps nothing could be of more importance, than the very transactions to which he refers. But why? not surely because he was maliciously jealous of the homage paid to a young princess of sixteen, by gentlemen ushers and fawning poets, but because in those transactions, he saw as plainly as possible, a design on the part of the *French Court*, or of the Guises at least, to dispute at once the validity of Elizabeth's title to the Crown; to prepossess the minds of the French, the English, and the Scotch, with a notion that Mary was the rightful heir to the throne of England, which in truth she might seem to be through her grandmother, if Elizabeth were illegitimate, and any parliament could be collected to repeal the act enabling Henry to dispose of the succession by will. Both Elizabeth and *Mary* had been bastardized by parliament; but the Catholics had prevailed in the late reign to set aside the bastardy of Mary; thereby leaving Elizabeth no right by blood. Another parliament by the influence of Protestants, might have just as great a right to replace Elizabeth where she stood, as long as Henry's union with Katherine of Aragon remained cancelled, that is, as through her father, next in blood to Edward, and having once had that right, she was justified in resorting to it, as a title, which neither her father's caprice, nor his compliant parliaments, could totally annihilate.

We have already taken some pains to shew this, and shall only therefore add, that *Cecil* must have known how necessary it was, *immediately* to resent such claims, backed, as they now were, by France, having Scotland on its side; he must have known how common it had been with the English Mary, when her sister was under a cloud, to taunt her with her illegitimacy, and rudely to remind her that Mary of Scotland ought to succeed herself; he must

and mischievous designs, constantly directed against *England* and its *Sovereign*, that had we found nothing better to say of *Cecil*, than that he was, in all the above particulars, a match for his opponents, we should have proceeded very confidently with our history; but, for *such* times, and considering what ought to have been, and what were, the constant objects of his care and attention, we have no hesitation in saying, that his wisdom was consummate, his policy most skilful, his designs always directed to the preventing or frustration of mischief incessantly threatening the peace and happiness of England, the surety of its Sovereign, and the permanent establishment of the Protestant Religion.

have known, for it was not long concealed, that France was at work with the Pope to dethrone Elizabeth as a bastard, by the thunders of the Vatican, and advance Mary directly to the English throne.\* All these things he must have known; and was he to suppose, that it was only through the forwardness of some underlings of the French Court, or the sycophancy of some imprudent poets, that Mary, the Dauphin's wife, and Queen of Scotland, had been publicly decorated with the additional titles, and the proper armorial insignia of a Queen of England and Ireland? In the eye of a discerning statesman, the designs of the French, and of the Catholics every where, could not possibly have been more significantly displayed, than in the assumption of the *title* and arms of Queen of England and Ireland by Mary, *at the moment of Elizabeth's accession*.† To the latter it was not only an insult and affront, but a *threat*; and it would have been little less than treason in a Minister so acquainted with the state of France and Scotland as *Cecil* was, to overlook it; “but, if it seems,” as Mr. Chalmers says, “not to have been inquired how far the *Scottish Queen* partook in the impertinence of ushers, or in the imprudence of poets,” it seems to have been duly understood by Elizabeth's attentive Minister, how much the Scottish Queen was at this time under the *control* of the French Court, or House of Lorrain; and how much evil *they* meditated towards England, through Scotland.‡ It is absurd to attempt to put any other construction upon the entries, of which we have been unwillingly induced to say so much, in consequence of the very perverse construction that *has been* put upon them by others.

Though no interruptions took place in regard to the negotiations for peace,

\* The Pope himself, Paul IV., in declaring that he could not rescind the decrees of his predecessors, Clement VII. and Paul III., who had declared her incapable of succeeding, left no room to doubt of the aspect of things at Rome; but Elizabeth was soon rid of this great enemy, as he died in the first year of her reign, Aug. 18, 1559, in the 90th year of his age: his last advice to the Cardinals was, to multiply the courts of Inquisition, as the only means of preserving the Church.—*Jurieu*. Great rejoicings were made at Rome on his death.—See *Forbes*, i. 234, or *Turner's Modern History*, i. 555.

† The mere assumption of the arms, without any other implied pretensions against the actual occupier of the English throne, might indeed have been overlooked, perhaps, as a mere piece of family pride, since Mary's own mother of the House of Lorrain, bore for arms, we are told, six pieces; viz. I. Hungary; II. Navarre; III. Jerusalem; IV. Anjou; V. Barr; VI. Lorrain.—See *Sandford's Royal Genealogies*. But James, Mary's father, never having quartered the English arms, as we have shewn, rendered the case a direct affront to Elizabeth.

‡ See Throckmorton's Letters to Cecil in *Forbes*, and the extracts from them in *Turner's Modern History*, reign of Elizabeth, i. 555-6.



yet every care was taken to strengthen the places most exposed to the attacks, either of France or Scotland ; as Portsmouth and the Isle of Wight, Dover and the Cinque Ports, Wales, Guernsey, Ireland, but particularly Berwick and the marches towards Scotland ; and as the Treasury was very low, and unprepared for any very expensive measures of defence, many modes of raising money were resorted to, more adapted to the emergencies of the moment, than upon any settled plan of finance, except by the strong hint they conveyed to the fiscal officers of every description, that they had now got a Sovereign and a Minister, who would not overlook any defalcations of the public revenue, or any blots in their accounts. Arrears were called in with great strictness, and Commissioners appointed to take account of all monies owing to the Crown, on various occasions, and from different persons and places : Sir Thomas Gresham also, the careful agent of former Sovereigns, was sent to borrow money at Antwerp on city bonds : great endeavours, in the mean while, were made to keep things quiet with regard to religion. The public mind was naturally in a state of great agitation upon these points. The Romanist anxious to keep things upon the footing Mary left them, yet dreadfully distrustful of the Queen and her Council ; while the Reformed party, too eager to evince the sense they had of their recovered liberty (for the Queen had already set many prisoners free), made too hasty and violent attacks upon the churches, and every symbol they could find of Popery, that had been restored in the last reign. Some restraints therefore, according to the twelfth article of the *Secretary's* celebrated memorial, were put upon *preachers* : the pulpits, in such moments of agitation and alarm, being too generally abused by both parties, to the purposes of strife and contention. Sermons were allowed to be preached before the Court, and the selection of such preachers, gave but too much reason to the Romanists to conclude, that the new reign would not be propitious to their wishes : in other places, notwithstanding the inhibitions of Government, many rash and indiscreet discourses were delivered, to the great disturbance of the public peace. In the mean while, the great cause of religion was in no manner overlooked by Elizabeth or her advisers. As soon, even, as her first Council was appointed, she has the credit given her, of having selected a certain number out of the whole body, to concert measures for retrieving the cause of the Reformation, and bringing things back to the state in which they had been left by her brother, Edward VI. ; but before we proceed to take account of their plans, we must advert to the meeting of Parliament.



It had been summoned for the 23d, but, on account of the Queen's being ill, did not meet till the 25th of January, 1558-9, when it was opened by the Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon,\* with a speech of considerable length, ("a most excellent and solid speech," says the author of the *Biographia Britannica*,) delivered in the presence of the Queen, and in which we find such authentic notices of the actual state of things, as to demand our attention; though having already touched upon these points, we need not transcribe it at length.† After declaring the Queen's will to be, that in all cases, even such as "might by means, be reformed without Parliament," that great national assembly should be consulted; and that, "at this time particularly, she meant not to make any resolutions in any matter of weight, before it should be, by both houses, sufficiently and fully debated, examined and considered:" he proceeds to touch upon such points as seemed most immediately to demand their attention; as first, the care of religion, or "the

\* The purity of this Parliament having been called in question by Catholic writers, and attributed specially to the arts of Cecil, (See Cobbett's *Parliamentary History*, 648.) it may not be amiss to observe, that nothing was done as to the choice and nomination of members, that had not, under different circumstances, been practised by Mary. Many Popish magistrates were removed, and such put in their places, as were likely to influence the return of Protestant members. It was done to counteract an adverse interest and party, which had already evinced a disposition to act in a similar manner: indeed, in another instance (the device for altering the religion, of which we shall soon have to speak), it is expressly suggested, that only those means shall be resorted to, that Queen Mary had adopted on a similar occasion. [*Strype, Annals*, i. p. 11. 396.] The times were revolutionary, all Europe over; and whatever one party did, the other could not but also do, or attempt to do. Upon any change of situation—upon a mere change of ministers, such things may be said to be done to this day; and if it be intended to promote any great good, or ward off any great evil, as is generally the ostensible reason, the returns to Parliament must be looked to: perhaps, the only real difference is, that the Sovereign is not brought forward to bear a part in these party negotiations, as was notoriously the case in former days; [*See Hallam's Constitutional History of England*, i. 48.] but this indecency removed, a minister cannot be expected to put himself at the head of affairs, without some confidence in the support of the Parliament, to which he may have to submit his measures. In the times of which we are writing, one inquiry or one provision, might seem to include all the rest,—Catholic or Anti-Catholic, was the great question to be asked. The open manner in which the interference was carried on, was proof enough, that the "arts of Cecil," were rather the avowed practices of the times, than any unconstitutional arts of his own. The Tudor Parliaments in general, do not seem to have required much art, to bring them into compliance with the Courts: still however, as Mr. Hallam remarks, the care taken to procure favourable elections, shews the increased weight of the Commons, or *lower House of Parliament*.

† It is printed at length in D'Ewes, and in the *Biographia Britannica*.

well making of laws for the according and uniting of the people of the realm, into an uniform order of religion;" secondly, "for the reforming and removing of all enormities and mischiefs, that might hurt or hinder the civil orders or policies of the realm;" and thirdly, "deeply and advisedly to weigh and consider the estate and condition of the realm, and the losses and decays that had happened of late to the imperial Crown thereof, and devise the best remedies to supply and relieve the same." In the agitation of the questions concerning religion, he admonished them carefully to avoid "all sophistical, captious, and frivolous arguments and quiddities, meeter for ostentation of wit, than consultation of weighty matters, comelier for scholars than counsellors," and studiously to abstain from "all contumelious and opprobrious words; as heretic, schismatic, papists, and such like names:" in which it will be seen, that in the former advice, there was an evident reference to the jargon of the schools, hitherto so much in vogue amongst the Romanists, and whereby men's minds were in danger of being bewildered and perplexed; and in the latter, view was had to the peace of all parties: the terms "heretics and schismatics," being as common in the mouths of Romanists, as directed against the friends of the Reformation, as the term Papist, in the mouths of the latter. All was to be directed, according to the Lord Keeper's advice, "to the honour and glory of God, to the establishment of the Church, and to the tranquillity of the realm." He wished, says Rapin, to have them steer their "course between superstition and irreligion, which might re-unite the adherents of both religions in the same public worship:" a remark of some importance from the pen of a writer of his principles.

In regard to civil matters, a general review of the existing laws was recommended, particularly as to their sufficiency to repress enormities, and account to be taken "whether any laws be too severe or too sharp, or too soft and too gentle; and the inclination and disposition of the people to be considered."

The general aspect of things, he remarked, was such as might administer to the mind of every true Englishman, comfort and discomfort, joy and sadness. Comfort, from the consideration of the virtues and qualifications of the new Queen, "to whom nothing under the sun, was so dear, as the hearty love, and good-will of her nobles and subjects, nothing so odible, as what might cause, or procure the contrary;" discomfort, from a view of "the great decays and losses of honour, strength, and treasure, which had happened to the Imperial Crown;" particularly, in the surrender to the enemy of Calais,

and other Continental possessions; with the waste of revenue, loss of munition and artillery, of many valuable lives, and the exposure of our trade and merchandise for want of a navy, sufficient havens, and frontier garrisons.

The reparation of these great losses, and other matters, as they would greatly impede her Majesty's liberality towards her subjects, so would they call for expenses, much to be regretted; but he added in conclusion, "Her Majesties will and pleasure is, that nothing shall be demanded or required of her loving subjects, but that, which they of their own free-will and liberalities be well contented, readily and gladly, frankly and freely to offer." \* One thing he judiciously introduced in manifest allusion to Mary's assistance of Philip in his foreign wars, which, by its ill success, had so greatly disquieted the people: "she was a Princess," he observed, "that never meant nor intended, for any private affection, to advance the cause or quarrel [of another] with any foreign Prince or Potentate to the destruction of her own subjects." †

From the view that has now been taken of the state of the nation at the period of Elizabeth's accession, we must surely be brought to the conclusion, that it could be no ordinary, certainly no vain or wanton, ambition, that could induce the great statesman whose life we are recording, to place himself in a situation of such notorious difficulty and danger. Every thing so out of order at home, as to encourage the boldest attempts of foreign enemies, if not actually invite their attacks; an immediate competitor for the crown, close at hand, the Queen of one portion of the very island so exposed to attack, a princess of the Romish Religion, on the eve of being Queen of France also, closely related to a powerful family there, bigoted in their attachment to the Church of Rome, and in their opposition to all who had hitherto manifested a disposition to cast off her yoke; and finally, the Pope, ready with his bulls and anathemas to bastardize whom he chose, to cancel any tie, dissolve any obligation, dispense with any oath, that might be held, by his Catholic subjects and adherents, to stand in the way of their projects and endeavours, to hinder the progress of the Reformation, and

\* See what regard was shewn to the wants of the nation by the Parliament.—*Strype's Annals*, 89.—Subsidy granted and levied by commission.

† We observe, that in this Parliament a place was assigned within the bar of the House of Lords, not only for the Lord Keeper being under the degree of a Baron, but for the *Queen's chief Secretary being a Knight*. The seats so appropriated, were at the uppermost part of the Wool-sack, in the midst of the House, except that when the Queen was present, the Lord Keeper stood behind the Cloth of Estate.—*D'Ewes*, p. 10.



root out heresy. And yet in the face of all these dangers, the case was made a case of *conscience* and *principle*; of attachment to the cause of the *Reformation*, and the liberties of the people as connected therewith. For, as Bishop Carleton observes in his 'Thankful Remembrance,' "If she (the Queen) would have admitted the Popish Religion, then might all these difficulties have been removed; but establishing the Gospell shee understood, with that shee drew all these troubles upon her own head; yet, she gave the Glory to God, and in hope of God's holy protection, she established God's Holy Truth." What is said of the Queen, applies more strongly, if possible, to her great Minister. In addition to the above, we cannot help copying the following remarks of the great Lord Bacon, Lord Burghley's near relative, for though his praise is given to the Queen, it must also be held to reach to her intrepid adviser: "For contempt of peril, see a lady, that cometh to a crown after the experience of some adverse fortune, which for the most part extenuateth the mind, and maketh it apprehensive of fear. No sooner she taketh the sceptre into her sacred hands, but she putteth on a resolution to make the greatest, the most important, the most dangerous, that can be in a state, the alteration of religion. This she doth, not after a sovereignty established and continued by sundry years, when custom might have bred in her people a more absolute obedience; when the reputation of her policy and virtue might have made her government redoubled, but at the very entrance of her reign, when she was green in her authority, her servants scant known to her, the adverse part not weakened, her own part not confirmed." In truth, but one servant will appear to have been so well known to her as to account for the conduct she pursued. The same author indeed, observes elsewhere, "It was no small fortune, to find at her entrance, *some* such servants or counsellors, as she then found;" his own father indeed was second only to *Cecil*. But Lord Bacon proceeds, "Neither doth she reduce or re-unite her realm to the religion of the states about her, that the evil inclination of the subject might be countervailed by the good correspondence in foreign parts; but contrariwise, she introduceth a religion exterminated and persecuted both at home and abroad; her proceeding herein is not by degrees and by stealth, but absolute and at once. Was she encouraged thereto by the strength she found in leagues and alliances with great and potent confederates? No, but she found her realm in wars with her nearest and mightiest neighbours. She stood single and alone, and in league only with one, that after the people of her nation had made his wars, left her to make her own



peace. Yet notwithstanding the opposition so great, the support so weak, the season so improper; yet I say, because it was a religion wherein she was nourished and brought up: a religion that freed her subjects from pretence of foreign powers, and indeed the true religion; she brought to pass this great work with success worthy so noble a resolution.”\*—*Bacon’s Discourse in praise of his Sovereign*. It required not only a cool head, and a practised judgment, but a most undaunted spirit, to undertake the defence of the nation at such a period, and uphold a Sovereign, whose title was in so many ways open to attack, and who could only defend herself by the choice of wise Counsellors and the attachment of her people.

One defence indeed against France and Scotland was proffered to her, but which, in the midst of all her difficulties, she had the resolution to decline. This was the hand of Philip, her late sister’s husband; a suitor, to whom she had been taught to think herself personally obliged for her liberty, if not for her life; and whose alliance, even if she did not marry him, was at this time almost essential to her preservation, and the security of her Crown. It was through his ambassador, the *Conde de Feria*, that Philip made these overtures, who was endeavouring besides, all he could, to impress the English Catholics with an idea, that nothing but such an union, could preserve to them their religion;† we may easily conclude, that all the Queen’s Protestant subjects, must for the very same reasons, have been just as much against it; besides the experience the nation in general had acquired during the last reign, of the woful consequences of so close a connexion with the bigoted court of Spain. The French also could not be expected to have their eyes shut to the consequences of such a match, as regarded their views both upon Scotland and England; and therefore, as the marriage could not take place without a *papal dispensation*, which Philip had *proposed to obtain*, the French Court entered at once into negotiations at Rome to hinder such a process.

But Elizabeth herself had great reasons to decline the proposal, however advantageous it might have been to her in other respects; had she allowed

\* “She feared not,” says one who knew her well, “all the potentates of the world.”

† The *Conde de Feria* (or *Duc de Feria*, as some call him) enlarged much upon the depressed state of the kingdom, and the difficulties of Elizabeth’s situation, unless she should consent to marry Philip. He represented the kingdom to be, according to Mademoiselle Keralio, “*dépourvue de garnisons, de troupes, de fortifications, de munitions de guerre, et d’hommes d’état*,” fortunately for Elizabeth, the latter was not the case.

Philip to apply to Rome for a dispensation to marry her sister's widower, it must have amounted to a tacit acknowledgment that the papal dispensation granted to her father to marry his brother's widow, was valid, and in so doing she must, by her own act, have bastardised herself; while to submit in any manner to such an act of supremacy on the part of the Pope, could not be less than to abandon her own supremacy, which she was about to resume, and greatly weaken the cause of Protestantism in her kingdom. Fortunately, Philip himself stood in need of England as an ally against France and Scotland, so that with fair words, and a due show of respect and civility, she was able to dismiss this powerful and important suitor, without any immediate detriment to her affairs, if we except this one circumstance, that in the negotiations for peace which were going forward, and by which Philip was in all honour bound, if he could, to recover *Calais* to England, which had been sacrificed to his politics, he became remiss as to that article, and it was obliged to be left in the possession of France.\*

\* The marriage of Elizabeth would certainly have been an event of great importance to the nation, in checking competitors, and establishing her throne, upon a footing of foreign alliance; needful in some quarter, to withstand the assaults of her powerful enemies, in France, Scotland, and at Rome. It was in the first year of her reign therefore, that she was addressed by her Parliament to marry, but without effect. She was married already to her people, she told them, and could be contented to have it inscribed on her tomb, *Here lies a Virgin Queen*. Suitors however, were not wanting, her hand was solicited by the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, and by some of her own subjects; or if not actually solicited by the latter, yet there were some, who, it is thought, might have been welcome suitors. Besides the Master of the Horse, Lord Robert Dudley, Sir William Pickering has the credit of being a favourite at this time.—See Jewel's Letters to Peter Martyr, in *Burnet*, vol. iii. and *Aikin's Court of Elizabeth*. But Cecil appears to have been anxious rather to countenance a proffered connexion with the Imperial Court, through the Archduke Charles, the son of the Emperor Ferdinand, and brother to the King of Bohemia, a Prince of excellent qualities, and judged to be favourably inclined towards the Reformation. Burnet says, "known to be a Protestant," and indeed such accounts seem to have been communicated to the English agent Mount, by no less personages than the Elector Palatine and the Duke of Wirtemberg. But Cecil could not succeed in this as he wished, much however passed upon the subject both at home and in Germany. The Emperor professed not to wish to interfere with Philip, being so near a relative, but to offer one of his own sons, should the latter not be accepted. Whatever might be the private sentiments of the Archduke, the Emperor plainly intended to give support to the Catholic Religion, on which very account the Queen has the credit given her of declining the offer. It is curious, that after being himself rejected, Philip should become a suitor for his German relative the Archduke; he even wrote a long Latin letter to Elizabeth, to be seen in *Haynes*, in which he assures her, "*Nihil in præsentia nobis*

Camden, Rapin, and other writers, suppose, that it was Philip's proposal which hastened the Queen's measures to effect another change in religion, and reduce things to the state in which they were left, by her brother King Edward, imagining that this once effected would put an end to Philip's importunity. But, she appears to have required no hastening; she was only slow in order to be the more sure; Bishop Aylmer, in his famous book before referred to, entitled, "an Harbrough for faithful subjects," gives her, and consequently her Council, credit for attending to the maxim of Seneca, "*Velox consilium sequitur pœnitentia*," that repentance was sure to follow that counsel which was taken too speedily; and therefore he adds, she walked wisely, as one of God's chosen instruments, by using correction without severity, by seeking the lost with clemency, by governing wisely without fury, by weighing and judging without rashness, by purging evil humours with deliberation; and to conclude, in doing her duty without affection.\*

We have already noticed that on the first formation of her Council, some select persons, either of their own will or by the Queen's appointment, applied themselves to consider the state of religion; and are supposed to have very early entered into deliberations upon the subject; though secretly, and with a prudent regard to the feverish state of the public mind. About the beginning of December indeed, which must have been within a month of the Queen's accession and Mary's demise, "a device," Strype tells us, "was drawn up by some notable hand, and offered to Secretary Cecyl, and which by the steps afterwards taken appeared to have been followed; by whose pen it was writ," he goes on to say, "doth not appear. I suspect it to have been either John Hales, a man of a politic and working head, and a zealous Protestant, and Clerk of the Hanaper to the Queen, as he had been to King Edward VI., or Sir Thomas Smith, a very

*evenire posset gratius, nihilque magis studium nostrum erga serenitatem vestram et ipsius regni amplitudinem, accenderet*,"—in fact, he wished to keep England in his own family, at all events.—See Lord Montague's account of his conversation with *Gasper Preynor*, the Emperor's envoy, interlined by *Cecil*.—*Haynes*, 233, see also Lord Burghley's notes in *Murdin*, May and June, 1559.

\* The following passage from Lloyd's *Worthies*, is too applicable to the beginning of Elizabeth's reign to be omitted. "He," (Sir Ralph Sadler) "learned in King Henry VIII.'s time, as Cromwell's instrument, what he must advise (in point of religion) in Queen Elizabeth's time, as an eminent counsellor. His maxim being this, *that zeal was the duty of a private breast, and moderation the interest of a public state*. The Protestants, Sir Ralph's conscience would have in the commencement of Queen Elizabeth kept in hope; the Papists, his prudence would not have cast into despair. It was a maxim at that time in another case, *that France should not presume, nor Spain be desperate*."—Vol. i. 107.



wise man, and Secretary of State to King Edward, and I am rather inclined to think it the latter.”\*

“In which device,” for we cannot do better than copy Strype as far as it may be necessary, “are these questions, with practical apt answers to them. I. When the alteration shall be first attempted? The answer to which is, at the next Parliament. II. What danger may ensue upon the alteration? The answer to which weighs the danger from the Bishop of Rome, from the French King, from Scotland, from Ireland, and from many people here at home. III. What remedy for these matters? Distinct answers, as France, Rome, &c. IV. What the manner of doing it? The answer propounds certain learned men to contrive, and bring in a book, or platform of religion ready drawn to the Queen; and having her approbation, to be put into the Parliament House.”† We cannot follow this learned and diligent writer through all the questions and answers given, but shall only observe that the learned persons selected, were particularly of those, who had been cashiered or driven into exile by Mary, ‡ as Bill, *Parker*, May,

\* The meetings were to be holden at his house in Cannon Row. To mark the extent and variety of his talents and occupations, “*there*,” says *Lloyd*, “you might see him a leading man among the Statesmen, *here* most eminent among Divines.” But this was the character of several of his contemporaries, and of none more than the Secretary himself; of the pains taken by the latter at this time, by consultation with Guest, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, a good account may be seen in the *Annals*, i. 120.

† The Device which is still extant, (Cotton. MSS. Julius F. 6.) is well worth consulting, as shewing first, the boldness of the attempt, to restore the Protestant Religion in the face of such very formidable opponents; secondly, the comparatively easy manner proposed of removing the professed Papists from places of trust and power; thirdly, the determination to uphold and assist the Reformed in other countries; and fourthly, the making the measures of the late Queen, for re-introducing the Romish Religion, the model for the re-establishment of the Protestant Religion.

‡ It may reasonably be questioned whether these exiles, or *Marian* refugees, were not in rather too much haste to return, as far as regarded their own ease; hence the complaints made to their friends abroad, of *neglect* on their arrival.—See *Strype's Annals*, i. ch. x. particularly by the celebrated John Fox. The moment they heard of Elizabeth's accession, they came in numbers from Zurich and Strasburgh, leaving the hospitable roofs of those who had given them the most friendly entertainment there, as Bullinger, Gualter, Weidner, Simler, Lavater, Gesner, &c. Not but that some appear to have been *called* home, as Grindal particularly, Horn, Sandys, &c. to assist in the work of the Restitution of the Church; able preachers and ministers being much wanted. It may be indeed, that they were *too urgently* called home, to allow of proper preparations being made for their reception; Grindal's expression to Fox, *cogor urgentibus amicis in Angliam iter instituere*, implies this, considering that the letter bears date December 19, 1559, scarcely a month after



Cox, Whitehead, Grindal, and Pilkington; Sir Thomas Smith was to call them together, and assist them in the work: in the mean while all innovation was strictly forbidden; but the course even of these proceedings, the names and characters of the persons selected, and the hands through which it was to pass, plainly shew how immediately upon the accession of Elizabeth, the cause of the Reformation began to revive. The Device itself, with the answers, may be seen both in Burnet and Strype, but copied from different manuscripts. At the same time, as a review of the Liturgy was deemed to be an indispensable preliminary, to the alteration of the Church Services; this task was assigned to the following very eminent scholars and *divines*; Parker, Bill, May, Cox, Grindal, Whitehead, and Pilkington, who were to carry on their work privately, and in fact, with the knowledge only of some very particular persons about the Court, such as the Marquess of Northampton, the Earls of Bedford and Pembroke, Lord John Gray and Sir William CECIL (Camden), of the influence of the latter in this important business we have a curious proof, in the remark of Sampson the Puritan, as long after as the year 1574, in a letter to the then Lord Treasurer Burghley, alluding to the Liturgy, he writes,—“What your authority, credit, and doing then was, you know, God knows, and there are witnesses of it.”—*Strype, Annals*, i. 119.\*

The Queen's own principles it must be confessed, were at first liable to *some* doubts. She had received the mass in Mary's time, and appeared attached to

Mary's death, but they must have been the more wanted, because many episcopal sees required filling; ten were actually vacant, and four more expected daily to become so. (See *Jewel's Letters to Peter Martyr*, Burnet, iii.) Whatever inconveniences however they may have had to encounter on their first return, the Government seems to have been in no manner backward to employ them, by appointing them to preach before the Court, and at Paul's Cross, in which some acquitted themselves with more discretion than others: King Edward's Liturgy and Service being restored by the first Parliament, in which Sir Anthony Cooke, Lady Cecil's father seems to have been very active, and appointed to be brought into use on a particular day, viz. June 24, 1559, not only the Papists, but some of the returned exiles of Calvin's school, at first refused to comply; though several of the latter afterwards altered their minds; and when the Papists objected to the interference of the laity, *their Bishops* having protested against the passing of the bill, in the House of Lords, they were properly reminded by Pilkington, afterwards Bishop of Durham, that Parliament had set forth no new religion, but only restored what had been with the consent and approbation of the Clergy, “godly began under good King EDWARD;” and consistently with this representation of matters, I find in a MS. in the Harleian Collection, 1386, Queen Elizabeth's title set forth, as the “Defender of the *trewe, ancient, and Catholic Faith*.”

\* See what Strype says further upon this subject, 120;—and Oglethorpe's submission and profession of his faith, *Burnet, Records*, vol. ii. no. liii.

some of the symbols and other superstitions of the Church of Rome; “concerning the Cross, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints,” says Camden, “*she had* no contemptuory opinion, nor ever spoke of them but with reverence, nor suffered others patiently to speak unreverently of them.” This gave confidence to the Romanists, and hurried the Reformists into some excesses, but her prejudices soon underwent a change. It was early after her accession that she forbade Oglethorpe to elevate the Host, and though she might have confessed, as it is alleged of her, to the Spanish Ambassador Count *Feria*, and the Lord *Lamac*, that she acknowledged the *real presence* in the Sacrament, yet this cannot prove that she believed the Transubstantiation. The Church of England to this day professes to believe a *real presence* to the faithful, though certainly neither in the way of transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, but “only,” as the article states, “after an heavenly and spiritual manner;” we are rather disposed to admire the wise caution, attributed to her when in danger of erring upon this point, and yet unwilling to speak decisively; she is said to have replied to those who were sent by Gardiner to inquire what she thought of those words of Christ, “this is my body:”

“Christ was the Word that spake it;  
He took the bread and brake it;  
And what the Word did make it,  
That I believe and take it.”—*Howell's State of Great Britain*.

There was certainly much ingenuity in this,\* whether true or not; nor did she deviate from it, when she proposed that some alterations in Edward's Rubric should be made, that might seem, as it were, to leave the precise *nature* of the *real presence* still undecided. “And lastly the Rubric that was added at the end of the communion-office, in the second book of King Edward VI. against

\* To pretend to define the *real presence*, even where Transubstantiation was admitted, would have been absurd. Who could believe that the following differences occurred between the *Jacobins* and *Cordeliers* at the Council of Trent, though it is very credibly reported; the *Jacobins* pretended, as *Jurieu* writes, that the body of our Saviour is made present in the Eucharist, by way of *production*, because the body of Jesus Christ without coming down from heaven, where it is in its natural being, is rendered present in the bread by a *re-production* of the same substance, according to which doctrine the substance of the bread is changed into the substance of the Lord's body. The *Cordeliers* on the other hand, defended *that* Transubstantiation which is called *adductive*; they alleged that our Lord's body is brought down from heaven, not by a successive, but *momentary* change, and that the substance of bread is not changed into the substance of the body of Jesus Christ, but that the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ *succeeds* into the place of the substance of the bread being conveyed thither from another place!!—*History of the Council of Trent*, 285.—1551.

the notion of our Lord's *real* and *essential* presence in the Holy Sacrament, was left out in this ; for it being the Queen's desire, if possible, to unite the nation in one faith ; it was therefore recommended to the Divines, to see that there should be no *definition* made against the aforesaid notion, but that it should remain as a speculative opinion not determined, in which every one was left to the freedom of his own mind." In the first year of the next reign an addition was made to the *Catechism*, concerning the Sacraments, as it stands at this day.—See Introductory Discourse to Wheatly's Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer. How far the *real* presence might conscientiously be asserted, by those who did not go the length of acknowledging the doctrine of transubstantiation, may be seen in Ridley's reply to the Lords Commissioners at Oxford in the late reign, 1555. As the *real* presence is undoubtedly a Church doctrine at this time, and was so accounted by Jewel in his famous Apology, at the period we are treating of, (see *Enchiridion Theologicum*, i. 217, &c.) we shall venture to transcribe the following reasonable account of it, to be found in Rogers's Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England, on the 14th proposition of the xxviii<sup>th</sup> article. The *regenerate* have in them a double life ; one *carnal*, the other *spiritual*. The life *carnal* and *temporary* they brought with them into this world : the *spiritual* was given to them afterward, in their *second birth* through the Word, 1 Peter i. 23. The life *carnal* and *corporal* is common to all men, good and bad, and is maintained and preserved by *earthly* and *corruptible bread*, common also to all and to every man : the life *spiritual* is peculiar only to God's elect ; and is cherished by the *bread of life* which came down from Heaven, which is *Jesus Christ*, who now sitteth and sustaineth the *spiritual life* of *Christians*, being received of them by *faith*, John vi. 35, 52. which *faith* (being in place of *hands* and *mouth* to the soul) we verily receive the *true body* and the *true blood* of Christ, to the cherishing of the *spiritual life* in 'our souls,—and for this he cites many foreign confessions, besides the Scriptures.

The Question of the Eucharist was certainly the most important question to be discussed, between the Romish and Reformed Churches ; because the doctrine of Transubstantiation was calculated to raise the Romish priesthood so high in the estimation of the people, that there was little likelihood of prevailing against them, unless this doctrine could be overthrown. For what indeed did this doctrine infer ? that by the consecration of the elements, the Priest was able to bring down from heaven the very body of the Word incarnate, and having done so, to offer it up again as a living sacrifice, for any sins committed, by the



quick or the dead ; a power so great must needs inspire the ignorant multitude with a most superstitious awe of the persons of the Priests, especially as the dispensers of *pardons*, by virtue of the atonement they always had to offer afresh, for the sins of individuals, in the sacrifice of the mass.\*

According to the principles of the Reformation throughout Europe, the great point to be ascertained was, whether this doctrine had undoubtedly the support of Scripture, now adopted and received by all Protestants, as the only standard of truth, or rule of faith. And how could this be more effectually and respectably decided, than by conferences and disputations of the learned of both parties ; several such conferences and disputations had already been holden, as we have shewn, but as the last reign had unsettled what, if not fully settled under Edward, had been nearly so, there could not have been a graver or more satisfactory mode adopted, of bringing this question to an issue, for the rest of the Queen's reign, than by making a fresh appointment of learned persons, once more to discuss it, with all the weight and authority that could be conferred upon them, and all the solemnity which so serious a discussion might require.

On the meeting of Parliament, therefore, this course was adopted ; the opportunity for it being much improved by the return of those learned and very eminent divines of whom we have spoken, from the shelter they had sought in foreign countries during the persecutions of the late reign ; and as the expedient in contemplation, seems particularly to have proceeded from the advice and suggestions of the *Secretary*, † it is probable, that he was the occasion of their being

\* It is curious to trace the origin and course of these abuses. The Sacrament, at first, was always administered. None came to the Christian assemblies who did not stay to receive the mysteries ; and in the poverty of the Church, the clergy were supported by the people's oblations at the altar : afterwards the people grew remiss in their devotions ; but the priests, to keep up the oblations, persuaded the laity to come to the Sacrament and offer, though they did not stay to receive the Sacrament ; and deluded them with the notion, that it was sufficient for the Priest alone to receive in behalf of the whole people, and as they had changed the symbols into the very body and blood of Christ, so they changed the festival, commemorative of his sacrifice, into a real expiatory sacrifice, and persuaded them that the Priest's consecrating and consuming the Sacrament was propitiatory for the dead and the living.

† The account given by the Domestic of this Conference is not judged to be quite correct. He says, that it was not only “ by his *Lordship's* advice there was a Conference had in Westminster Church, by the old and new Bishops, and other learned men, upon some questions and points devised principally by *himself* touching the exercise of Religion ;” but that it was “ so politically handled, and by himself (Lord Burghley) so wisely, learnedly, and temperately *governed*, that such satisfaction was given, as the Quene, and whole state of Parliament, with one consent



so soon and so earnestly called home. It may have been in a great measure to satisfy the Queen's mind, who did not wish to have the Catholics too roughly handled, and who had certainly some tincture of Romanism in her disposition.\*

A public disputation was therefore appointed by the Privy Council, to be holden between certain of the Popish bishops and other learned men of their communion, and as many *Protestant* divines; eight on one side, and eight on the other.

The four Catholic Bishops and four Doctors were these; *White, Watson, Baine, and Scot*, Bishops of Winchester, Lincoln, Lichfield and Coventry, and Chester; with *Dr. Cole*, Dean of St. Paul's; *Langdale, Harpsfield, and Chedsey*, Archdeacons of Lewes, Canterbury, and Middlesex. And on the Protestant side, *John Scory*, late Bishop of Chichester, *David Whitehead*, *John Jewel*, *John Aylmer*, *Richard Cox*, *Edmund Grindal*, *Robert Horne*, and *Edmund Guest*, the latter particularly nominated by Sir William.

The points to be argued, and which are very commonly referred to the *Secretary*, † were these three, First, whether it is against the word of God, and the custom of the ancient Church, to officiate, and administer the sacraments, in a language unknown to the people? Secondly, whether every Church has authority to appoint, to change, or to set aside, ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, provided the same be done to edification? Thirdly, whether it can be proved by the word of God, that there is offered in the mass a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead? The Papists were to defend the negative of the

establishe d the forme of Religion now used and preached all this Quene's tyme, to the glory of God, the honor of the Quene, the peace of the realme, the weale of the people, and the profitable praise of those that weare instruments to worke so notable a blessing for theire contrie, as to bring it into the bright shyning light of the Gospell." That the Secretary was the *adviser* of the Conference, and the *drawer-up* of the propositions, Mr. Peck thinks true enough, but that he governed or presided over the Conference, he thinks wrong, that being decidedly the place and office of his *brother-in-law*, the Lord Keeper.

\* Her great objections to the marriage of the Clergy, in all likelihood, prevented any bill being brought into Parliament this Session, to revive King Edward's acts for the marriage of Priests, which Mary had repealed. We shall see hereafter, how much the Secretary exerted himself to remove these prejudices from the Queen's mind.

† Nothing could be more reasonable on the part of the surviving friend and co-adjutor of the martyrs, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, than to bring the Papists to such a trial; when they knew, that under Mary, they could engage in a Conference with the Protestants with a certainty of success, they were willing enough to dispute, now they made pretence, that the Catholic cause ought not to be submitted to such an arbitration.—See *Neal's History of the Puritans*.

first, and the affirmative of the last question, and the Protestants were to make good the affirmative of the second.

These disputations and conferences, were to take place, and did take place, as far as they went, in the presence of many of the Nobility and Commons in Westminster Abbey, and before the Lord Keeper Bacon, as President or Chairman, to keep order, and hold the parties close to the terms of the question, without, however, having any voice in the decision of the several points. They began on the 31st of March, 1559.

Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History, has given us as full an account, perhaps, as can be necessary of this celebrated Conference, which as far as regarded the Government, may be considered as adopted more for form-sake, than any thing else; that is, as the Convocation had put out its articles, in hopes of retaining the Romish faith in all its force, to evince its disposition still to hear both sides, before the measures of the preceding reign were definitively cancelled, and so far it must have done good; for the course and conduct of it was such, as plainly to shew, that the Papistical party sought to interrupt matters by their shifts and cavils, in such a manner, as to frustrate the end in view; which was, no doubt, to have the second question fairly established in the affirmative, and the untenableness of the other two, exposed; for the satisfaction of those who might otherwise hesitate to return to the principles of the Reformation; for it can scarcely be doubted, but that the issue of the contest was foreseen by those who set it on foot, the Papists never being able to encounter with those who take the Scriptures *alone* for their standard. Nevertheless, they had every fair opportunity afforded them of arguing the points upon that ground, if they had chosen it; or even upon the writings of doctors and fathers of the Church, and the ancient Councils, for in these things the Protestants shewed themselves quite ready to contend with them; but they would not submit to the *order* enjoined, of delivering their sentiments in *writing*; and, indeed, by other objections of a most frivolous and captious nature, plainly betrayed the weakness of their cause\*—had their cause been good, neither learning nor abilities were wanting, to have given them a better countenance in the argument.† But they

\* The best defence made for them, probably is, that without the consent of the Pope, they could not allow such great matters to be called in question.—*Camden*.

† In the House of Lords, the learning of the Popish divines may be said to have been displayed in the speeches of Hethe, Archbishop of York, Scot, Bishop of Chester, and Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster, on the bills for restoring the Queen's supremacy, and the new Service Book.

undoubtedly gave up the contest, not having the same disposition to dispute *now*, as was the case under the former reign; while the Protestants were anxious, and proposed to go on, as Bishop Jewel declared in one of his Sermons, “for at the last disputation that should have been, every one knew which party gave over, and would not meddle.”

It might have been well, if the Government could have been excused punishing the refractory disputants on the Popish side, but it is certain that they were judged worthy of punishment, according to the course of proceedings in those days. Sanders\* indeed informs us, that some of them proposed to excommunicate the Queen, and the leading parties; praising their *magnanimity* in this. White and Watson were the most forward in recommending the measure of excommunication; for which they were committed to the Tower. Great pains appear to have been taken to mitigate the severities of the punishment, and that, very much in consideration of the dignity and character of the sufferers.†

On the 8th of May, 1559, the Parliament was dissolved; on the 24th of June, the act for the use of the English Prayer Book took place; at which time the oath of Supremacy being tendered to the Bishops and Clergy, all the Bishops, except Kitchin of Landaff, refused it; this gave the Queen and her Council great displeasure, but afforded the former a good opportunity of openly declaring how resolved she was to cast off the usurped and pretended authority of the See of Rome. It was at this time, that some discoveries took place, of a secret corres-

Speeches, in which, as Collier rightly says, “they argued with something of colour, and made a bold push for their persuasion;” which they might do the more confidently, because there were at the time no reformed Bishops in the House to answer them, and the controversy was too much embarrassed with ecclesiastical learning, to be managed by the temporal Lords. The Author of the Memoirs of Lord Burghley, alluding to this Parliament, observes, that Popery was overthrown, and true religion restored, “all within three months, while the Bishops, who were zealous creatures of Rome, and all the Popish Lords, sat, voted, and spoke in Parliament, fiercely as well as freely. So that the Reformation came in openly and legally by the voice of the people and authority of the legislature. Such was the happy issue of wise *Cecil’s* well-concerted scheme.”

\* Sanders is in general a good authority with Catholic writers. Dr. Lingard, however, says nothing about the excommunication, but merely states, that it was *pretended* that the disputants, who were imprisoned or fined, deserved this severity by their disobedience; *but the real object was*, as he adds, by the imprisonment of the two prelates and the fear of the punishments which threatened others, to silence the opposition in the House of Lords.—Vol. v. 154, 4th edit.

† Strype’s Annals, i. chap. v.



pondence with Rome, during King *Edward's* reign, in which these Bishops had a share, being countenanced and upheld by the Princess Mary, late Queen, among whose papers many important letters to that effect had been lately found. Being self-deprived or ejected by their own refusal of the oath of Supremacy, their Sees became vacant. What became of them severally, may be seen in Camden, Strype, Collier, &c.

Some notice perhaps should be taken of the proceedings of the Convocation, though its attempts, to keep things on the footing they were in the last reign, soon failed. It met on the 24th of January, the day *before* the Parliament assembled, instead of the day *after* as was intended, had not the Queen's illness interfered, a circumstance which has led Collier and others into a mistake. Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury was chosen prolocutor of the Lower House, and Boner, there being no Archbishop of Canterbury, presided in the Upper. In hopes of preserving their religion, they came to an agreement upon five articles, which they wished the Bishops to lay before the Upper House of Parliament the next day. The three first related entirely to the Sacrament of the Altar, being the very articles maintained at Oxford against *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Latimer* (see our first volume); and if these articles would have settled the faith of the country, they had decided that, in the Sacrament of the Altar, by virtue of the words of Christ spoken by the Priest, the *natural body* of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and his *natural blood* were present *realiter*. That after consecration there remains no substance of bread and wine, but only the substance of God and man; and that in the mass the true body and true blood of Christ are offered, as a propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead. The two other articles related to the power, authority, and infallibility of the Church, as derived to the Pope from Peter the Apostle; and this was almost all that passed in this Convocation, which only lasted till the middle of May. It does not appear that the articles were ever exhibited to the House of Lords, though given by Boner to the Lord Keeper, and though Mary's Bishops and some Abbots still sat in the House.

The proceedings in Parliament were certainly very different from the proceedings in Convocation; tending as much to establish the Reformed principles, as the acts of Convocation were designed to maintain those of the Church of Rome.

The following is a fair but concise enumeration of the acts passed, in the first year of the Queen's reign, as connected with the Church.

\* I. An Act restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state,



ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power\* repugnant to the same.

II. For the uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and the administration of the Sacraments.

III. Of recognition of the Queen's Highness' title to the Imperial Crown of this realm.

IV. For the restitution of the first-fruits and tenths, and rents reserved '*nomine decimæ*,' and of parsonages impropriate, to the Imperial Crown of the realm.

All these bills, and some more that might be mentioned, particularly such of Edward's reign as were now revived, after being repealed by Mary, were vigorously opposed by the Popish Bishops still in the house, and upon the question of the Queen's supremacy some very curious speeches were made, particularly by Archbishop Hethe, Scot, Bishop of Chester, and Abbot Feckenham. The latter of whom allowed himself to fall into an abuse of our early Reformers, for which he was well corrected by Strype. The Papists, however, were not the only objectors: those who had come from the school of Geneva began now to avow their principles; and to object, as far as they could venture to do it, to all magisterial influence whatsoever with the Church. Presbyterianism had now been long on foot; the year 1541 being assigned as the period of its commencement. As a settled rule, of the reformed church of France and Switzerland, lay-elders were admitted to be members of the synod, but the synod itself was to be independent of all civil rule; appeals to it being admitted even against the royal authority itself, where any thing treasonable was objected against persons in the discharge of any ministerial duty or office. The objections made to the Queen's assumption of the title of Supreme Head of the Church, though ill-founded in reality, seems to have been judged so worthy of attention as to lead to a change of the title, and an explanatory article, as we shall have occasion to shew hereafter.† It deserves attention that, on Elizabeth's accession to the throne, the affairs of the Church were by no means brought to the simple question, as between Catholics and Protestants, Romanists and Reformists. The latter were divided on points both of doctrine and discipline; many were for adopting the Augustan Confession of

\* Trial was made this very year to send into the kingdom a nuncio from the Pope, *Martinego*: but being deliberated upon at Greenwich, it was determined to be against the ancient and late laws of the realm, and that he could not come without great peril to the peace of the kingdom. In 1560, 1561, the attempt was repeated, but finally failed.—See *Strype's Annals*, i. 165, 166.

† Injunctions for ordering of matters of the church and religion, called the *Queen's Injunctions*, as put forth in virtue of her supremacy, were published at this time, supposed to be framed or com-

the Lutherans, which excited great jealousy and alarm in the breasts of those who had been more connected with Switzerland. We shall find this difference to be the occasion of difficulties, of no small moment, all through this reign; and perhaps attended with more trouble to Lord Burghley than to any other individual in the kingdom. One act of this Parliament, connected with the affairs of the Church, however, must not be passed over: we mean the act for giving authority to the Queen's Majesty, upon the avoidance of any archbishoprick or bishoprick, to take into her hands certain of the temporal possessions thereof, recompensing the same with parsonages impropriate and tenths.

It would draw us aside too much from the principal subject of our work to enter far into the history and circumstances of this act, especially as we have references to make, which may help to supply all that the reader may wish to know about it. Strype, as usual, relates the most important particulars of the proceedings, as dispassionately as any historian could be expected to do, considering that in the remonstrances of the clergy, there was certainly very much to turn the Queen aside from an act of manifest injustice, if she could have been so turned.\* But as many as fourteen sees being vacant, and Queen Mary's Popish Bishops having, in expectation of their own short sway, granted such leases, as amounted almost to alienation, it is no wonder that the spoliation should go on, especially as there were those at hand, among the returned exiles, who thought some abridg-

piled by the persons to whom had been confided the revisal of King Edward's book, and subjected afterwards to the review of Sir William Cecil, as Strype intimates; and in which he seems, from a passage in one of Archbishop Parker's letters to him, 1575, to have gone a little too far in that Prelate's opinion; "whatever the [Queen's] ecclesiastical prerogative is, I fear it is not so great as your pen hath given it in the Injunctions;" (see Strype's *Annals*, i. 236.)—but notwithstanding the Archbishop's misgivings, it would seem from the admonition annexed to the Injunctions, about the oath of supremacy, particular care was taken to point out the limits of the *Regale*, or ecclesiastical supremacy upon the very principle of the 37th Article of the church.—See Strype's *Annals*, i. 236. Collier, ii. 433.

\* We cannot positively vouch for the advice given by the Secretary on this occasion, but as the best remonstrance was addressed to the Queen herself, by his old friend Dr. Cox, Bishop of Ely, "an ancient and very learned man," as Strype calls him, "and in great esteem both with the Queen's father and brother," and as some of the remonstrances of Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, were immediately addressed to him, we may reasonably suppose that he was by no means a principal promoter of the bill. In the reign of King Edward VI. we have shewn that he wished to be set right upon the subject, even in cases where he could not prevail against the covetousness of others. The Popish Bishops, by their corrupt manners, had doubtless in many instances abused their riches, but certainly not in all, witness the rich *endowments* we owe to them, in a great variety of places.

ment of the worldly means of Bishops might render them better pastors than the Popish Bishops, their predecessors, with their king-like power, had shewn themselves to be. Jewel himself wrote thus to Simler, who had been among the first to congratulate him upon his becoming a bishop ; but Jewel does not justify the act. Collier, as may be expected, is very warm upon the subject, though not without reason, when he is read with candour, and a just regard to the equity of the case. In the Commons, it seems, when the bill was to pass, 134 were for it, and 90 against it. "Could I recover," he says, "the names of those ninety gentlemen who dissented, I would do them the justice to transmit their memory to posterity : but they will suffer nothing by the silence of records ; for if the rest of their lives answered this vote, they will always stand in a much better register of honour than history can give them." He draws the following conclusion besides, after his usual manner, from the total omission of the clergy in this and other commissions for taking accounts of the Bishops' lands, &c. "From hence the reader may perceive this, Queen Elizabeth's, Parliament was under no excesses of superstition, no manner of partialities to the Church." Though Collier is not considered as a very temperate judge of such cases, in many points he certainly has justice on his side. The parallel he draws between this case and the Queen's wards, p. 423, is very much to the purpose.

But it is time to look to the *Continent*. We have already seen, that the negotiations for peace, begun in the late reign, were not allowed to suffer any interruption ; that, on the contrary, fresh powers, and new Commissioners were sent out, to bring things if possible to a conclusion. Towards the very close of the last reign, as is related in our first volume, England had suffered, through the ignorance and supineness of Mary's Ministers, more bent upon extirpating heresy than defending her possessions, the most mortifying and distressing loss that could possibly have occurred. We mean of course the town of Calais, the key of France, the proudest trophy of the battle of Cressy ; nor had the capture of this town, by the admirable skill, valour, and judgment of the Duke of *Guise* (the victorious defender of Metz against the power of Charles V. in 1552), redounded more to the *disgrace* of England, than to the *glory* of France, smarting under the wound inflicted on her by the battle of St. Quintin. To recover this fortress could not fail to be one of the first objects in any negotiations for peace ; where the credit and strength of England were felt and valued as they should be ; and this seems indeed to have been the case with the three *Commissioners* originally employed by *Mary*, though not with her feeble and insensible



*Ministry*; for it is remarkable, that on the 18th of November, 1558, the very day after Mary's death and Elizabeth's accession, dispatches had been made up for England, which admirably express the anxious desire of the Commissioners (Lord *Arundel*, Bishop *Thirlby*, and Dr. *Wotton*), to rouse the Ministry at home to a just sense of this very circumstance. The dispatch, indeed, which may be seen in Burnet, iii. 458, relates chiefly to the restoration of Calais, the importance of which to England (and in a great measure to *Philip* also with regard to the Low Countries, which must then have appeared a material object), is admirably set forth. It is written in a style of *remonstrance* with *Mary's Ministers*, who in a previous dispatch to the Commissioners had shewn, as it appears, some disposition to relax upon this point, which the Commissioners lamented, considering wisely enough, that so far from any such sacrifice being a step to a more *secure* and *lasting* peace, nothing could shew more evidently that the French did not intend to continue the peace than their eager desire and fixed determination to retain Calais; for with Scotland on one hand, and Calais on the other, and their pretensions on both kingdoms, in virtue of the rights and claims of Mary Queen of Scots, it was easy to conjecture what might ensue. "The French," they observe, "would sign any terms to keep Calais, but these would be only parchment and wax," as their words are. "These and other considerations," they continue, "make us to be of opinion that leaving Calais to the French, they will be content to deliver you a peece of parchemyn, sealed with a little wax; but that they mean any contynuance of Peax, we cannot be persuaded, no more than King Francis did by a nombre of peeces of parchment sealed, which he sent to King Henry VIII. nor the French King that now is, did by the Parchemyne sealed, which he sent to King Edward VI."

This dispatch must have come to the hands, not of *Mary's old* Ministers as intended, but Elizabeth's new ones; and on this account it is certainly extremely curious. We plainly see from it, the perfidious enemies with whom England had to deal.\* We see in its strongest light the magnitude of the loss she

\* I find a curious passage relative to Calais, in a letter written eight years earlier, from Dr. Wotton to Sir William Cecil: "And knowing the great desyre that they (the French) have to live in peace with us, that is to say, to have *Calais* again, (for the keeping thereof say they, is the onely cawse of any warre betwixt us, and they having recovered that once from us, would not fayle ever after to lyve in peace with us,) an orator of less eloquence than *Tully*, might peradventure persuade me that our frendes having suche occasion, wolde have as moche respect to their commoditie, as to theyr Promess, which is wonte to bynde French mene as long as it shall please theym." This letter is dated from Canterbury, January, 1550, and may be seen in Haynes.

had sustained through the weakness of Mary's Ministers; we see their supineness about the recovery of it after it had been lost; we see besides, what is particularly important, the knowledge the Commissioners and the Government at home entertained of the designs of the French upon England, in case of a vacancy of the throne, for though this may be thought to be expressed obscurely, the passage cannot well be otherwise interpreted; especially as the dispatch was in answer to one from the Ministry, of Nov. 8th, in which they notice the Queen (Mary's) great weakness, and that they were driven to mistrust the worst. The expression was this; the French, they remind the Ministry, could easily annoy England on the side of Scotland; the Dauphin being then married to the Queen of Scots: "*and what the French pretended unto by that marriage, is not unknown to your Lordships.*" (This probably was, says Burnet, to claim the Crown of England upon the Queen's death.)

We may now then see the importance of Lord Burghley's memorandums relative to the assumption of the royal title and arms of England and Ireland; as decisive marks of what was supposed to be intended by the French, even before Mary died, and consequently before *Cecil* had any concern with the Government; and we may see how much the loss of Calais must have contributed to favour such pretensions, being taken besides by the Duke of *Guise*, the uncle of Mary Queen of Scots.\*

But peace, or at least a truce, was rendered particularly necessary to Elizabeth, by the very disasters that had befallen Mary. She wanted the protection of stronger garrisons at home, both towards France and Scotland;

\* In the first volume of Forbes's View of the Transactions in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, p. 15, may be seen a letter from Dr. Wotton to Sir William Cecil, dated from Brussels, Jan. 9th, 1559, in which the views of the *GUISES* with respect to the Scottish Queen's pretensions are so plainly set forth as particularly to deserve the attention of the reader. This letter may also serve to shew in what estimation Sir William was held, by the very servants and ministers of the newly deceased Sovereign. Dr. Wotton was a Catholic and a very eminent Statesman, and yet no man could write more unreservedly or confidentially to Sir William, than would appear to be the case from this very letter; nor could any man more sagaciously set forth the little trust to be placed in the French, as negotiators for peace. He wished for peace heartily and sincerely, but, says he, "I mean a peace indeed, and not the name only of a peace, or a piece of paper, only containing words of a treaty of peace;" but of such a "true peace with *France*," he seems utterly to have despaired, pp. 18, 19. The whole letter, as amounting to a plain proof and demonstration that Elizabeth's new *Protestant Secretary*, did not think worse of the French and their views upon England through Scotland, than Mary's own *Catholic Minister Plenipotentiary*, is extremely worth reading.

she wanted money wherewith to accomplish this, and time to do it in. But if Calais were apparently so irrecoverable while Mary lived, and Philip had a double interest in obtaining it, it could not but be much more irrecoverable by Elizabeth's Commissioners, after Philip's addresses had been declined, and, Mary's occupation of the throne being come to an end, the pretensions of Mary Queen of Scotland, backed by the power of France, and the hopes of all zealous Catholics, began to be brought into operation. True indeed it is, that Philip had reason to prevent its passing into the hands of the French, if Elizabeth's Crown could be preserved to her against the pretensions of the Queen of Scots; but of this, Philip and the Spaniards in general seem to have doubted, since, as Camden relates, in their apprehensions, lest the French should obtain England in right of Mary, they had endeavoured privily to withdraw from England the Lady Katherine Grey, as the heir of the Suffolk line, in order to set her up against Mary Queen of Scots, upon the credit of Henry's will. To surrender Calais entirely would have made any peace extremely unpopular, but without the means of insisting on its immediate restitution it would have been idle to have continued the war.\* On the 2d of April therefore a peace was concluded, according to the following entry in Lord Burghley's notes.

"April 2. Peace concluded at Casteau in Cambrensis for France and Scotland, by Charles Cardinal of Lorraine, Arras de Montmorenci, Jaques Albon Marquis of Fronsace, and Seigneur of St. André, John Morvillier Bishop of Orleans, and Claude Aubespine, Secretary; and for England, by the Lord William Howard of Effingham, Thomas Bishop of Ely, and Dr. Nich. Wotton."†

And on the 7th, according to the same notes, it appears, that this peace, made with the French King and the Queen of Scots, was proclaimed at Casteau in Cambrensis, and that on the 18th the treaty of Cambray for Scotland was confirmed by Francis and Mary, King and Queen of Scots.

What was stipulated with regard to Calais on this occasion, though misrepresented by French authors, *Mezerai* and *Daniel* in particular,‡ whom *Rapin*, however, corrects, was this:

\* In the Secret Memoirs of Leicester, it is strongly insinuated, that he suffered himself to be bribed by the French, to promote the surrender of Calais, p. 76, hereby imitating his father, who in the fourth year of King Edward, sold Boulogne to the French by a like treaty.

† The French called this, *la malheureuse paix*, from the concessions made to Spain.—See *Henault*, and *Dict. Historique*, Art. *Henri II.*

‡ In correcting these authors, *Rapin* throws in a caution, which we must confess we have found but too much reason to regard through the whole course of our researches. "This



"That the King of France should have Calais, and the other places in Picardy conquered from the English, for the space of eight years; after which he should be obliged to restore them to the Queen of England.\* That within the space of six months seven foreign merchants, not subjects of the French King, should engage for the payment of 500,000 crowns of gold to her Majesty; as a penal fine, in case the restitution of the place within the time limited, should be either refused or delayed by Henry or his successors; and that notwithstanding, whether the said sum were paid or not paid, the King of France and his successors should remain under the obligation to restore Calais and the other places, as they engaged by this treaty. Hostages also were to be delivered to the Queen till the promised security should be given. The names of the hostages may be seen in Rapin. One article in particular stipulated that neither the King of France, nor the King

shews," says he, "how we ought to be on our guard against the national partiality of historians." Henry was exceedingly blamed for the concessions he made to Philip by this peace, to gratify or recover his friend the Constable. Pasquier, speaking of it, calls it, *Paix non moins honteuse à la France, que celle de l'Empereur Jovinian avec le Roi de Perse, tant descrite par toute l'ancienneté*. The number of places surrendered to Philip and his generals, were certainly enormous. The acquisition of Calais was certainly a great *set-off* as regarded his views upon England, but this was only to be retained, after a certain period, by a breach of honour, or a doubtful war. Of this peace, Bayle has much to say in his article upon Henri II.; he seems to allow, that France stipulated to restore Calais at the end of eight years, "*et il engagea solennellement la France à restituer Calais à Angleterre au bout de huit ans.*"—*Note C.*

\* We may conclude this article not to have been of Dr. Wotton's framing, if what Lloyd relates of him be true. "He would say," says Lloyd, "rather give away Calais, than reserve a right in it fifteen years hence; for never was the interest of any nation so constant, as to keep a promise half so many years."

That royal infants should be married in their cradles, as it were, is a fact, of which, however strange, history affords many proofs. Mary Queen of Scots is one, who was *so* sought by Henry VIII. for his son, [vol. i.] but this point of Calais had nearly led to two contracts of marriage between persons unborn, and perhaps never likely to be born. The French, it seems, at one period of the negotiation, in order to make sure of England one way or the other, proposed that the eldest daughter of Francis and Mary *when born*, should marry Elizabeth's eldest son *when born*, and Elizabeth's eldest daughter *when born*, be united to the eldest son of Francis and Mary; that Calais should be restored, with the daughter of France, and all claims upon France by England, be relinquished upon the marriage of Elizabeth's daughter.—*Forbes's Transactions*, vol. i. 54. Strange, that, as it turned out, not one of these betrothed, or to-be-betrothed infants, should have actually ever come into the world!

and Queen of Scotland, nor the Queen of England, should attempt any thing against one another, either directly or indirectly, in prejudice of this treaty. That if the Queen of England violated this article, the King of France and the King and Queen of Scotland, should be freed from their agreement, and their hostages and securities discharged; and if the violation came from France, they should be obliged to restore Calais and the other places, as if the eight years were expired; and if they refused to make this restitution, the securities and hostages should still remain bound."

There was also another article to the following effect: "That all the other pretensions of the King and Queen of Scotland, and the Queen of England, with all their exceptions, should remain entire, in the expectation that Providence would produce some good opportunity to terminate them by a peace."

And in regard to Scotland, a special treaty was signed, to prevent encroachments and hostilities on either side.\*

But on the part of France all this was found to be unsound and unstable; and that the French had only agreed in order to cajole Philip, who with some remains of honesty and regard towards England, had declared that he would not sign the peace, before Elizabeth had concluded hers.

This was very apparent, when upon the arrival of Ambassadors from France at Brussels, to see the peace sworn, Ardoy, who appeared there on the behalf

\* In May, ambassadors from the French Court, among whom was Mons. Montmorency, arrived in London to witness the ratification of the treaty on the part of the Queen. They were received with great state and magnificently entertained by her Majesty, who seems to have had nothing to amuse them with, so much, as the baiting of bulls and bears with English dogs, and which appears to have so greatly interested their Excellencies, as to induce them to take many English mastiffs with them on their return to France.—See *Nichols's Progresses*, i. 67, 68. The Queen, however, soon discovered that it was to her advantage to encourage military shows and exercises, of which an account may be seen in the same book. There also may be read all that passed during this first of her reign, in visits to her different palaces, and the houses of her nobility. Among the first so honoured with her royal presence, seems to have been the Lord Cobham, at his seat near Dartford in Kent, now the residence of the Earl of Darpley; in Lord Burghley's notes it is stated to be on the 21st of July, that "the Queen's Majesty made her progress into Kent, and was at Cobham Hall," but in *Nichols's Progresses* it is said to have been on the 18th. This discordancy of dates is so common in the 16th century in regard to such and even greater transactions, that it is scarcely worth noticing.

of the Dauphin and Mary Queen of Scots, gave them the titles of King and Queen of Scotland, England, and Ireland ;\* and this offence was repeated, by the assumption of the arms, &c. to such a degree as to require the interposition and remonstrances of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, the English Ambassador in France ; who received from them such frivolous explanations and excuses, as plainly to evince, as Rapin observes, the little regard they had for his mistress.

But had they been more sincere than they really were, when the peace was settled in April, there happened an event in two months afterwards, which increased all the hazards to England, and produced great changes in France and Scotland. This was the untimely and most unexpected death of Henry II. of France. It had been ordained, that the peace between France and Spain should be cemented by two royal marriages ; the King of Spain was to marry the Princess Elizabeth, † daughter of Henry II., and Philip's great general the Duke of Savoy, Henry's sister, the Princess Margaret. The ceremonies accompanying these marriages, were to be attended with a great deal of magnificence, and particularly, according to the fashion of the times, with justs and tournaments. The French King was exceedingly fond of these military exercises, being very expert and skilful in them, so that public notice was given of one to take place, called *pas d'armes*, which was to last three days, and in which the King was to be the first challenger. On the first day, he sustained several assaults, and received great applause ; he did the same the second day, which was the 30th of June, but unfortunately, when the entertainment might have been concluded, the day being far spent, and the Queen had expressed a desire that he would tilt no more, yet such was the pride and pleasure he took in it, that he could not be prevailed upon to omit sending a lance to the Count of Montgomery, Captain of the Scots' guard ; they both entered the lists, ran against each other, and broke their lances, when a splinter from one of

\* After the notice we have taken of the slurs cast on Lord Burghley, for the entries in his notes relative to the assumption of the title and arms of England and Ireland by Francis and Mary, it may be well to copy the following passage from Sir James Melvil's Memoirs. "The Secretary d'Ardois also was sent out of France, to swear the peace in the name of the Dauphin of France and the Queen of Scotland, giving them this new style, in the name of Francis and Mary, King and Queen of Scotland, England, and Ireland, &c. ; whereat the Duc d'Alva and Cardinal Granvel smiled, saying, 'This will breed some business, ere it be long.'" He adds, the Cardinal of Lorraine shortly after caused to be renewed all the Queen of Scotland's silver vessels, and engraved thereon the arms of England.—*Melvil's Memoirs*, 46.

† Often called Isabella.



them, striking upon the visor of the King's head-piece, went very deep into his right eye. From this wound, after suffering much pain,\* he died on the 10th of July, leaving the Crown to pass to Francis, the young husband of Mary Queen of Scots, who by that means became Queen of France, as well as Scotland, being undoubtedly by blood, a presumptive heiress also, to the Crowns of England and Ireland. †

\* Different accounts have been given of the effects of the wound, some say he never spoke afterwards, the lance having penetrated to the brain; some, on the contrary, relate many speeches and remarks he made on his death-bed. See *Bayle*, Art. *Henri II.*, note.—Our own Ambassador, Throckmorton, was present, and has given the following account of what he saw:—"The force of the stroke was so vehement, and the pain he had withall so great, as he was much astonished, and had great adoo (with reeling to and fro) to keep himself on horseback, and his horse in like manner did somewhat yield. Whereupon with all expedition, he was unarmed in the field, even against the place where I stood; and as I could discern, the hurt seemed not to be great; whereby I judge he is but in little danger. I saw a splint taken out of a good bigness; and nothing else was done to him upon the field: but I noted him to be very weak, and to have the sense of all his limbs almost benumbed, for being carried away, as he lay along, nothing covered but his face, he moved neither hand nor foot, but lay as one amazed. There was marvellous great lamentation made for him, and weeping of all sorts, both men and women."—*Forbes*, i. 151.

† Henry was a brave Prince, and we may reasonably allow him the credit of being so, having to cite, in support of it, the authority of Elizabeth herself, if *Brantome's* account be true, who writes thus:—"J' ai oui conter à la Reine d' Angleterre qui est aujourd'hui, que c'étoit le Roi et le Prince du Monde qu' elle avoit plus désiré de voir pour le beau raporte qu' on lui en avoit fait, et pour la grande renommée qui en voloit par tout. Etant à table devisant familièrement avec ces Seigneurs, elle dit ces mots, (apres avoir fort loué le Roi) c'étoit le Prince du monde que j' avois plus désiré de voir, et lui avois déjà mandé que bien-tôt je le verrois, et pour ce j' avois commandé de me faire bien appareiller mes galeres (usant ces mots) pour passer en France exprés pour le voir." The same story is told in the *Memoires des Dames galantes*; but it can scarcely be true, as referring to the first year of her reign; she could never have intended at that time to have crossed the water merely to see Henry II. Bayle however has put it into his Dictionary, as an *Historiette* that should not be lost. There is another odd story for which we have the authority of Lord Bacon. "When I was in France," says he, "I heard from one Dr. Pena, that the Queen Mother, *Catherine de Medicis*, had caused her husband's (the King's) nativity to be cast under a feigned name, and the *Astrologer* gave a judgment that he should be killed in a duel; at which the Queen laughed, thinking her husband to be above challenges and duels; but he was slain upon a course at tilt, the splinters of the staff of Montgomery going in at his beaver." We must not conclude the story of this accident without observing that the King nobly forgave Montgomery, and forbade all processes against him for the injury he had sustained. Catherine de Medicis is supposed however never to have forgiven him, but to have gratified a long rankling revenge by his execution, in 1574. It must nevertheless be granted, that Montgomery had given great offence by taking arms

Those who have formed an estimate of Elizabeth's character, from the many strange traits she exhibited, of a more than womanish vanity, in regard to her person, and her powers of captivating both foreign and domestic suitors, have allowed themselves to think that the foundation of all Mary's troubles, was laid in a paltry, but deep-rooted jealousy on Elizabeth's part, of the comparative youth and beauty of her young cousin. In the very first year of her reign, Mad<sup>lle</sup>. Keralio does not scruple to write, "*Depuis longtemps l'extrême beauté de la reine d'Ecosse avoit fait naître dans l'ame d'Elisabeth une secrète aversion pour elle.*" But to speak the truth, there were much more solid grounds of jealousy and alarm to be found, in the state of Mary's pretensions and connexions. Of her own near relationship to the Crown of England, there could be no doubt; and as Elizabeth was supposed by her adversaries, to occupy the throne only in right of her father's will, which Henry had so constructed, as, apparently, to do great injustice to the issue of his eldest sister, Margaret, Queen of Scotland, it cannot be supposed, that there was not as much political jealousy on the side of Mary, as on that of Elizabeth; let her temper have been ever so amiable, or her heart ever so innocent. But her connexions were such, besides, as to expose her beyond every thing to the resentment of Elizabeth, independent of all personal jealousies. The house of Lorrain, though one of singular renown, stood at the head of a party devotedly attached to the Church of Rome, and as violently opposed to the cause of the Reformation. They were so powerful in France before the death of Henry II., as to induce that Monarch to procure the release of the Constable Montmorency from his captivity, as a prisoner of Philip, in order to counteract the over-ruling tyranny of the Guises, who now, by the King's death, saw their niece elevated to the throne of France, having in Francis II. a husband of so delicate a constitution, and talents so unsuited to the government of a great nation, as easily to inspire the Guises, who stood in the relation of uncles to Mary, with a will to rule as they chose, the affairs both of France and Scotland, and so it certainly turned out.

It is idle to talk, much more to write, of those times, as though the great quarrel were but a contest between two women, and in which some of the most insignificant of female passions were allowed to give a turn to the most

against the Government, as an arduous and zealous Protestant, and in assisting the Rochellers during their memorable siege. He was sprung from a younger branch of the Montgomeries, Earls of Eglinton, in Scotland. See a long account of him in the *Dictionnaire Historique*, Caen, 1786.

important events; from the first moment of her accession, Elizabeth may be said to have had arrayed against her, on some ground or other, all the greatest potentates of Europe, assisted by the craft and subtlety of able but dishonest politicians, the rancour of an exasperated hierarchy, and all the Jesuitical tricks of its superstitious votaries.

But Scotland was doomed to be the theatre, where the enemies of Elizabeth and England were to display their greatest feats; the French were never more determined to make it their "stepping-stone" to England than after the death of Henry II. It is said, indeed, that a confederacy was entered into between Philip and Henry, at the Peace of Cambray, to do their utmost to extirpate heresy, and there was much of this (as they called it) now prevailing in Scotland. We have already shewn, under the last reign, that the latter country, had, by a strange inconsistency, been made the refuge and sanctuary of divers persons, whose adoption of the principles of the Reformation, had rendered it unsafe for them to continue in England. The number of Protestants therefore in Scotland had now become considerable, and an object of attention to the Court of France. It was the great wish and desire of the Guises to be able to frame some reason for sending troops into Scotland, and by directing the Queen Dowager, their sister, to do her utmost to reduce the nation to an uniformity of religion, they hoped to be able to produce that disorder among the principal parties in Scotland, as might justify their sending troops thither, to support the friends of the Romish Church. Rapin's account of these things is short and tolerably correct.

Shortly after the marriage of the young Queen with the Dauphin, he writes, the affairs of Scotland began to be terribly embroiled. The Princes of Lorrain having formed the design to attack England by Scotland, believed it impracticable until the King and Queen were rendered absolute in their kingdom. They knew it would be difficult to persuade the states of Scotland to be the instruments of their ambition, in making war upon Elizabeth, in order to place the Crown of England upon the head of their Queen. The number of Protestants was now so considerable in Scotland that they were almost masters in the assemblies of the states; consequently it appeared impossible, to draw them into the project of dethroning a Protestant Queen, who was establishing their religion in England, to place a Catholic Queen on that throne, who might thereby be enabled to destroy the Reformation in both kingdoms. It was therefore necessary to find an excuse for sending an army into Scotland, to strengthen the Catholic party, which, probably, would be more ready and zealous



to favour the enterprise. It was with this view, that they obtained of Henry II. an order to the Queen Regent, and to d'Oysel, commander of the French and Sootch forces in the pay of France, to suffer no other religion in Scotland than the Roman Catholic. They easily foresaw this order would produce trouble in Scotland, and furnish them with a pretence to send thither an army. On the very day indeed after Henry received his fatal wound, according to Lord Burghley's notes, an augmentation of the troops in Scotland appears to have been ordered.

"July 1.\* The French King ordereth, that two hundred men at arms, and twenty ensignes of footmen shall be sent into Scotland. *La Brosse*, and the *Bishop of Amiens* appointed to go as Ambassadors into Scotland.

"On the 10th the King died, according to the same notes.

"July 10. Henry II. French King died.†

"July 11. Thomas Cecill‡ came out of France with news of the King's death."

On which very day, Lord Burghley also notes, that consultation was held there for the French King's style and arms for England to be joined with France, and then on the 16th follows the memorandum already cited, "Ushers going before the Queen of Scotts (being now the French Queen) to the Chappel cry, *Place pour le Reine d'Angleterre.*"§

\* On the 4th of July, Throckmorton from Paris, communicated to Cecil a project on foot among the *Guises*, to have the Earl of Argyle, Murray, and the *Lord Dun*, and a number of others their inferiors, "apprehended, their goods confiscate, and themselves to lose their lives."—*Forbes*, i. 152. He speaks of their using every endeavour to intercept his letters. *ib.*—See also p. 193.

† In September following the Queen caused his obsequies to be observed in great state, and at considerable expense in the cathedral of St. Paul's; for an account of which see *Strype's Annals*, i. ch. ix.—and *Nichols' Progresses*, vol. i. 76.

‡ Eldest son of the Secretary by his first wife, the sister of Sir John Cheke, vol. i. 7. born May 5, 1542, afterwards Earl of Exeter. Throckmorton, in a letter to the Secretary from Paris, June 10, 1559, thus speaks of him. "I assure you, Sir, in my opinion you have good cause to rejoice in him; and amongst other things, that being in the wantonest time of his youth, he is so honest, and so well stayed."—*Forbes*, i. 124.

§ It should be observed, that Mary's pretences to the English Crown, were very seriously questioned, by the most eminent statesmen, among whom the Secretary appears to have been one, on the ground of her being born out of the kingdom, and of parents not in the obedience of the King of England.—See the Memorial in *Sadler's State Papers*, vol. i. 731. and *Robertson*. Lady Lenox was judged by some to have a superior title on the above grounds, as well as on her nearer relationship to the Crown by birth, she being the daughter, and Mary only the grand-daughter of Margaret, sister of Henry VIII.

Could any thing well be plainer than this, as to the designs of the French Court, against Elizabeth. Mary, it is true enough, might be at that time only the innocent cause of these proceedings, but they certainly placed her in the situation of a dangerous rival to Elizabeth, as well as a bitter foe to the Reformation in England and Scotland; and as such, the wary\* minister and protector of Elizabeth, could not but keep his eye upon *her*, as the instrument wherewith the enemies of England and Elizabeth meant to carry on their machinations against both.

On the 27th of July some check seems to have been put upon these proceedings, for Lord Burghley makes the following memorandum on that day.

"The Constable of France (Montmorency the opponent of the Guises) staid the publication of the stile and armes of England." But this does not appear to have had any very general effect, for after that we find an entry as late in the year, as November 1559, the last month of the first year of Elizabeth's reign, stating that on Mary's entry into Chatelherault, her style was published as Queen of England. In the mean while, as Camden relates, other things occurred in France, offensive both to the Court and people of England; her merchants were injuriously treated, and her ambassadors publicly insulted. Ships from Marseilles were sent to cruise in the British seas, and preparations openly carried on in the sea-ports of France, manifesting much more extensive designs, than the mere preservation of Mary's Scotch Crown from a *faction*, as the reformed party were esteemed.

All these things put together may help us to form some idea, of the perilous situation in which Elizabeth stood, on her first accession to the Crown, and the

\* So far from being too forward, to guard against the French practices at this time, Throckmorton judged it not amiss to urge Cecil to be more quick in his preparations. "Albeit I know your carefulness is great," he writes from France, September 23, 1559, "yet being daily troubled with the common bruit of the French Queen's pretence to the realm of England, her open usurping of the arms and all other things sounding to that end, which it grieveth me to hear; I cannot hold my peace, but must needs put you in remembrance hereof. Let us not tempt God too far; and as Queen Mary did upon occasion (as she took it) of miracle shewed towards her over her enemies, be negligent in the charge committed to the Prince; referring all to God, without doing any thing ourselves; the success whereof we yet smart for."—*Forbes*, i. 238. In the very next letter indeed in the collection, he writes to Elizabeth herself, "I would to God, I had some true intelligence, and good occasion to vary in the course of my advertisements to your Majesty, concerning the French devotions and determinations, but they be so resolved, and make so good a reasoning in their opinion, that almost they care not who knoweth, that they mean to prosecute the French Queen's title to England." This letter is dated from Rheims, September 24, 1559.

need she had of a Minister, who could look through all these difficulties, discern their springs and consequences with a steady eye, without being dismayed at the impoverished and dismantled state of the Kingdom, through Mary's misgovernment, or disheartened in standing forth as the champion of Elizabeth's disputed title, and her defender against a host of foes, powerful, subtle, and intriguing, and upon many principles, bent upon her dethronement, the elevation of Mary of Scotland, and the subjugation of both parts of the British Island.

Here then we might conclude our account of the first year of the reign of ELIZABETH. If it did not appear still necessary to take a general view of ecclesiastical affairs, at this very important period, in order the better to understand, how cautiously,\* amongst a thousand difficulties, the Reformation was *revived*, and brought back as nearly as possible, to that state in which it stood, before the interruption of Mary's short but sanguinary reign.

We have already shewn, that for fear of hurrying matters on too much, the friends of the Reformation began at first to consult and act in secret. Select persons were chosen out of the Council, to consider of these things, of the changes that might be expedient or necessary, but above all, of the most advisable steps to be taken, to effectuate such changes, with the least possible disturbance of the public tranquillity; a select number of Divines, being in the mean while commissioned and employed, with as little noise and as much privacy as they could, to revise King Edward's Liturgy, of the original compi-

\* "La Reine Elisabeth ne precipita rien, parce que les changemens de religion dans un etat exigent une prudence infinie, elle gagna les cœurs, elle prepara les esprits."—*Millot*. The following remarks of this sensible writer, on the good effects of the Reformation, civil and political, may justly be added; especially as proceeding from a member of the Church of Rome, as the first sentence may serve to shew. "Si l'Angleterre eut le malheur de s'égarer dans la route du salut, la réforme lui fut avantageuse, à plusieurs égards, dans l'ordre civil et politique. La population augmenta, dès que le celibat religieux fut aboli, un grand nombre des fêtes, mal sanctifiées par la fainéantise, ne suspendit plus les travaux nécessaires à la société. Les disputes de jurisdiction, entre le sacerdoce et la puissance temporelle, ne rompirent plus l'harmonie interieures du gouvernement, l'industrie cessa d'etre reserrée et etouffée, par les possessions immense du clergé et des moins. On fut à couvert des entreprises et des exactions ruineuses de la cour de Rome, quantité d'abus qui faisoient perdre de l'argent, le temps, les sujets, se dissipèrent d'eux-mêmes." It may very reasonably be supposed that such an observer of things, and so close a calculator of effects and consequences, as Sir William Cecil at all times proved himself to be, must have foreseen all these civil and political advantages as likely to flow, from a resumption of the cause of the Reformation, as soon as he was at all able to give efficient advice to the Crown.



lation of which a full account may be seen in our first volume, that it might be ready to be brought into use again, as soon as ever the people could be properly prepared to receive it; this seems to have been estimated to require as much as seven months, or five at the least, after the meeting of Parliament, the latter having met on the 25th of January, and the revival of Edward's Prayer-Book being fixed for the 24th of June following. This gave time for the Convocation freely to declare its opinion on its five memorable Articles; it gave time for the passing of many acts repugnant to the authority of the Pope, particularly the act of supremacy;\* for the *revival* of many statutes of Henry and Edward,† which had been repealed by Mary, and it gave time for the proposed conference and disputation between the Popish and Reformed divines, which may be regarded as an answer to the five Romish Articles promulgated by the Convocation.‡ Two things may be said to have restored things to their old footing, as between Papists and Protestants. First, the Conference alluded to, which gave a fair triumph to the latter; and secondly, the tender of the oath of supremacy, as soon as the acts for the revival of the liturgy came into operation, which had the effect of disqualifying some ecclesiastics, though not more, as has been asserted, than 200 out of 9400 who held spiritual promotions or preferment; among these, however, were the principal dignitaries, bishops, and abbots, who had hitherto retained their seats in Parliament, and had been allowed to protest against what they could not be brought to approve; fourteen bishops and one or more abbots refused the oath. Those who took it, could scarcely be regarded as *proper* ministers, under the changes projected; but there was no immediate remedy; a public test had been supplied, and a very large proportion submitted to it, partly, as it has been thought, to keep the Protestants out of their churches.—See *Camden*.

\* *Strype's Annals*, i. 160. In discarding again the authority of the Pope, it is well known, that the Prayer in the Liturgy, to be delivered “from the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities,” was properly and discreetly expunged.

† There was no possibility of getting the Queen to assent to the marriage of the clergy, allowed by Edward. This put the clergy who were already married to considerable difficulty in getting their children legitimated.—See *Annals*, i. 118. The monasteries erected by *Mary*, were of course suppressed.

‡ Of King Edward's Liturgy, we have, as is before observed, given an account in our first volume; of the differences between the one now laid before the Parliament, and King Edward's second book, a statement is to be seen in *Collier's Records*, Vol. ii. No. LXXVII., see also the notes to Mr. Hallam's *Constitutional History of England*, p. 119, 120.

The feeling of the nation at large, and the actual situation of the Church, were left to be investigated by chosen Commissioners, sent out by the Queen as her representatives, or administrators of her ecclesiastical supremacy; particular circuits being severally assigned to them, in which they were to make their inquiries, establish what was right, and redress whatever should appear to them to be wrong. In this Commission, *Sir William Cecil* appears to have been associated (July 22, 1559), with the Marquess of Northampton, the Earl of Rutland, the Earl of Huntingdon, and other nobles; his friend and countryman, Sir Ambrose Cave, and divers Knights and Esquires; and the district assigned to them, included the dioceses of Oxford, Lincoln, Peterborough, Coventry and Lichfield. He was also joined in another Commission with Parker, Bill, and other eminent *divines*, to visit Eton College, and the University of Cambridge. An account of the Book of *Articles* to be inquired of, and of the *Interrogatories* and Inquiries adopted, may be seen in *Strype's Annals*, ch. xii. under the year 1559, where also a report is made of the course and effect of these visitations.

Though objections were made at the time, and have been made since, to this delegacy of the royal power, many grave authors have admitted that it did much good, and brought forward the reformed religion very considerably throughout the nation; the want of able ministers was nevertheless severely felt, and led to the admission into the Church, of some of very inferior callings; but yet not so bad as those whose places they were called to occupy, as *Calfhil* maintained in his book against *Marshall*: "Grant," says he, "that the inferior sort of our ministers were such indeed as our enemies object, such as came from the shop, from the forge, from the wherry, and from the loom; should you not think you find more sincerity and learning in them, than in all the rabble of popish chaplains, their mass-mongers, and their soul-priests." The language is certainly not polite, but his conclusion shews that he was thinking gravely upon the subject. "I lament," says he, "that there are not so many good preachers as parishes, I am sorry that some so unskilful are preferred: but I never saw the simple reader admitted into our Church, but in the time of popery ye should have found in every diocese forty Sir Johns in every respect worse."

The vacancies on the Episcopal bench, by death, or removal of those who refused the oath of supremacy, might have occasioned great embarrassments, if the Queen had been reduced to the advice of any persons less acquainted

with the history of *past* times, than Sir William *Cecil*,\* and his brother-in-law the Lord Keeper. Fortunately, their early connexion with the University of Cambridge, had given them a knowledge of the talents and characters of persons fitted for the new ministry, exceeding perhaps the experience of any other persons, not only in the court, but in the realm. We find the Queen accordingly ready to submit to the exclusive choice and judgment of *these two brothers* the important task of nominating a *Primate*; an appointment vacant from the day of the decease of the Cardinal Pole.

The choice of the two brothers was soon brought to concur, in fixing upon their old Cambridge associate and friend, *Matthew Parker*, of whom we have already found much to say in our first volume; he was not indeed so exactly a *contemporary*, as their great intimacy might seem to shew, being at the least sixteen years older than the Secretary, and by some years senior to the Lord Keeper, but the revival of learning at both Universities, had associated persons of all standings in the same studies; and *Parker*, *Bacon*, and *Cecil*, stand commemorated in the antiquities of Cambridge, as bound together in the strictest bonds of friendship.—See our former volume, p. 52. Sir John Cheke also was intimately acquainted with him, and is supposed to have stood godfather to his eldest son JOHN. The object of these great statesmen in their selection of a new Metropolitan, we are told, was to provide such a person for Archbishop, as might govern his province with discretion and moderation, abolish Popery, and promote the spread of the Gospel; yet not by methods of severity, but by persuasion rather than force.

At the time of the accession of Queen Elizabeth, Dr. Parker was living in all the obscurity to which he had been reduced, by the revolution of affairs under Mary, and we may well conceive from the character of the man, that he was much more prepared to shun, than court an appointment of such extraordinary importance and responsibility; and we have every fair testimony to prove that it really was so. Of his competency to fill the office there could be little doubt,

\* The delay in making new appointments appears to have given *Cecil* much concern. “Here hath been great slackness,” he writes to Throckmorton at Paris, July 9, 1559, “in appointing of Bishops, and as yet continueth; it will do much hurt for regyment. All parties be quiet, but the cathedral-churches be void of church service; upon visitation it shall amend I trust.”—*Forbes*, i. 156. This remark seems to exonerate the Secretary from being one of the instruments for keeping the sees open, to afford the Crown the better opportunity of seizing upon the temporalities.—See *Collier*, ii. 437.



if the misgivings of his own mind could have been speedily overcome ; his past life had in truth fitted him for it in every way possible, he had been chaplain to Queen Anne Boleyn, the mother of Elizabeth, and to Henry VIII., her father. After Queen Anne's decease, he had been Master of Ben'et College, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, *under Gardiner*, of whose imperious temper he had had many striking proofs ; he had been Dean of Lincoln, and a favourite preacher both at Court and at Paul's Cross in Edward's reign. He had been the friend of *Bucer*, *Cranmer*, *Latimer*, and *Ridley* ; and though dispossessed of all his preferment under Mary, no Refugee ;—he had, as well as *Cecil* himself and the Lord Keeper *Bacon*, escaped the torrent of the Marian persecution, resigned to the will of Providence, in the patient surrender of all the preferments he held in the Church ; and having availed himself of the permission granted to the clergy by the laws of Edward, to enter into the bonds of matrimony, he married into a family devoted to Protestantism,\* and under the cloud in which he lay with regard to the Court, passed his days in privacy and retirement, most contentedly, as he tells us himself, with his wife (a woman of high character), and his children. Great must have been the change contemplated. Strype well observes ; “from being a poor, obscure, absconding, and persecuted clergyman, to be advanced to the very top of ecclesiastical honour and trust in the English Church ;” but his reluctancy to take such a charge upon him, appears, from the letters that passed between himself and his two great friends, to have been most unfeigned. They may be seen in Strype, printed from MSS. not yet destroyed, or likely to be lost.

Though the second year of the Queen's reign had commenced, before the new Primate was actually consecrated, as will be shewn hereafter, yet it appears to have been in the month of August 1559, that after several ineffectual and earnest remonstrances he consented to receive the appointment at the Queen's express desire ; from which time he seems, as one admirably skilled in all ecclesiastical rites and usages, to have been consulted by the Secretary upon every point relating to the settlement of the Church, and particularly in the first instance, as to the filling the many sees and other places and preferments then vacant.

In the XIIth chapter of Strype's Annals of the Reformation, may be seen a transcript from the Secretary's own papers, not only of the void bishoprics,

\* Harlestone.

dignities and benefices, but of the names of sundry persons without promotion, worthy to be preferred and appointed to the several vacancies. From this paper it appears that eight or more bishops were *dead*, six *deprived*,\* ten living and not *yet* deprived, and that there were besides various prebends, benefices, and at the least one deanery to be filled up; nor was it alone necessary to consider who should be elevated to the bench in the room of the deceased or deprived prelates, but the mode of doing so, had from the peculiar circumstances of the moment no small difficulty in it. The want of an Archbishop alone threw things much out of course, and the attention paid to the subject by the Secretary in conjunction with Dr. Parker, is very striking; a body of instructions was drawn up by the latter, which also is still extant, with the marginal remarks of *Cecil*, from which it appears, that upon the question, whether the Popish Ordinal should be used, or that of King Edward VI. which had been abrogated by Mary, *Cecil* had scruples in his mind, in consequence of the latter not having yet received any fresh parliamentary sanction. Parker also evinced a great desire to do what he could to guard against any further spoliation or alienation of episcopal property, by bringing the new bishops under an express obligation, not to injure their successors, or impair the estates by long leases, improper grants, or felling of

\* The Emperor having written to the Queen in behalf of the Popish Bishops, and desiring to have churches set apart for the Papists in all cities and chief towns of the realm, he was answered, that the Popish Bishops, had opposed the laws, and did still wilfully reject and impugn the doctrine, which during King Henry and King Edward's reign they had publicly owned and declared, and notwithstanding their great cruelty to the poor reformed Protestants in her sister's reign, she would yet deal favourably with them; but as to assigning churches to them, it would be to act contrary to the laws now established by Parliament, to cherish factions, distract men's minds, and disturb the Commonwealth. England had adopted no new or strange doctrine, but simply returned to that professed by the primitive and Catholic Church, and approved by the Fathers.

On the deprivation of Boner, the see of London was conferred on Dr. Edmund Grindal, to whom the Secretary had always been a cordial and constant friend, as Strype has observed: they were more nearly of an age, than Parker and Cecil; Grindal having been born in the year 1519, his acquaintance with Cecil had also begun at Cambridge, where, to refer again to Strype, he was accounted "one of the wisest wits and learnedest men in the place." He had been Chaplain to Ridley, with whom he was a great favourite, as we had occasion to notice in our first volume, p. 381. During his retirement abroad he was assistant to Fox in collecting materials for his great work on the persecutions of the Church, in which he has the credit given him, of being scrupulously attentive to the truth of the facts reported to him; but as his whole history has been written by Strype, we need not go farther into these particulars, having more to say of him hereafter.

timber except for repairs, in which indeed (though one clause \* rendered it at first very imperfect) we may trace the original of those wholesome restraining statutes, which may be said to be still in operation to the protection, preservation, and permanent security of all scholastic, collegiate, and eleemosynary property.

In conjunction with such other Bishops as were already nominated and elect, † the new Archbishop exerted himself also strenuously with the Queen, to stay proceedings upon the extraordinary statute which had been passed, to empower her on any vacancies, to take such portions of the temporal revenues of the several sees, as she might choose into her own hands, in exchange for church lands, impropriations, tenths, &c. After what had passed since the beginning of the Reformation in King Henry's days, it was easy to see to what purposes this tended; to supply in short, not the Crown only, but through the Crown, the Courtiers with lordships and manors, in lieu of ecclesiastical property burthened generally with many charges.—The whole proceedings may be seen in Strype's Life of the Archbishop, exhibiting an excellent specimen of the new Primate's honest boldness, his admirable knowledge of the subject, and his zealous concern for learning and religion.

But there were no parts of the kingdom that required more immediate attention than the two Universities; and here it is remarkable, that he who had been Vice Chancellor of Cambridge, under *Gardiner*, should now have a *Chancellor* there so much after his own heart to deal with; for before Elizabeth had sat three months on her throne that high appointment had been tendered to the *Secretary himself*; who, though rather anxious to decline it at first, held it for many years, with great honour to himself, and benefit to the place. \* Had he received

\* The Crown was made an exception. The Bishops were to be barred making such grants, *unless it were to the Queen, her heirs and successors*.—See Collier, ii. 430.

† Strype's Life of Grindal, Ann. 1559, 1560.

‡ The Letter written by the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor, in acknowledgment of the honour conferred on him, is to the following effect. See *Peck's Desiderata Curiosa*, Vol. i. Book vii. Numerus IX.

Gulielmi Cecili, academix Cantabrigiensi; qua gratias eis omnibus agit ob eorum magnam erga eum benevolentiam, cum ipsum officio Cancellarii almæ ejusdem academix fungi precati essent. Dat. 19 Feb. 1558.

E Codice MS. penes.—Rogerum Gale. "Non vacat mihi, sicut maxime vellem, literis vestris respondere. Quamobrem, sicut ego vobis paucissimis respondere cogor, ita vos vicissim ea humanissime interpretari debetis. Munus hoc vestrum quod mihi detulistis, sicut vobis est ad donandum maximum, ita mihi homini in hoc ordine in quo positus sum prope infimo, ad recipiendum sane



this appointment in the zenith of his glory, when loaded with honours, and Lord High Treasurer of the kingdom, it might not appear a matter at all out of course, but in the very critical state of things at this time, three months only after Mary's death and Elizabeth's accession, while he was yet under forty years of age, and for the last five years, rather under a cloud than otherwise, the choice of the University speaks great things. First, the high respect borne to him, by a society of such discernment, upon an acquaintance not of present but of *former* years; in the times of Henry and Edward, if not also of Mary. It bespeaks a coincidence of feeling in that learned body, with regard to the religious principles of the new Sovereign, and the Secretary's design and purposes of restoring the Protestant faith. It bespeaks a strong sense both of the public and private character of the new Chancellor, a confidence in his talents and disposition to promote the interests of the University, and an approval of his conduct in all preceding circumstances. We have given an account, in our first volume, of the extraordinary state of the world, and of England particularly, at the period of Sir William's entrance at St. John's College, when Gardiner bore rule, and would fain have opposed all the efforts of the patrons of the new learning, to improve the condition of the University, particularly Sir William and Dr. Parker's two great friends, *Cheke* and *Smith*; and now we see two of the greatest promoters of that new learning, after a temporary depression, the one Chancellor of his favourite Uni-

difficillimum; itaque quid in hac re statuam, est quod magnopere dubitem. Etenim, cum vestrorum omnium tam concordēs in me animos; cum officii munerisque dignitatem cogito; magno mihi solatio esse videri posset, petitioni huic vestræ acquiescere.

Cum vero contra, fortunam meam, sane mediocrem, ac facultatem etiam pene nullam, intueor; concedere hoc vobis quod a me postulatis, nonnihil certe erubesco. Breviter enim mei usum vobis libenter concedo, ut, in omnibus vestri negotiis, meo in persequendis labore, ac in perficiendis etiam voluntate, uti possitis. Atque hoc quidem me monet officii hujus singularis quædam dignitas a vobis postulare, ut huic officio tam præclaro et honorando me præstantiorem velitis præficere; qui eandem possit, propter summam ejus auctoritatem, quam optime tueri.

Ego vero interim vestras causas, tanquam e vestro grege unus, et fideliter procurabo, et eisdem studebo etiam diligentissime.

Quid vos in hac causa tandem decernatis, cum priorum intellexero, facile perspicietis me non tam prolixè me vobis, in literis meis, de studio ac voluntate mea pollicitum esse, quam paratum me præbebo, ad liberaliter, cumulateque præstandum.

Multam fœlicitatem, cum summo Dei honore, vobis ex animo precor. bene valete; ex aula, decimo nono Februarii MDLVIII. vestræ dignitatis ac salutis studiosissimus,

GUL. CECILIUS.

Procancellario ac senatui Cantabrigiensi longe celeberrimo.

versity, the other Primate and Metropolitan of all England.\* It is no wonder, that, seeing these things, the adherents of Popery should take the alarm under an apprehension and foresight of the changes about to take place; many of the Popish heads of Colleges, as secretly reported first to Parker, and by Parker to the new Chancellor, had already begun it seems to provide for *themselves*, in case of ejection, out of the *College revenues*; to grant long leases, and levy exorbitant fines, to the detriment of their successors and College tenants, and to take other measures calling for a speedy redress. These things induced Parker to move the Secretary, to inquire early into the exact state of the Colleges, after the pattern of Gardiner in Queen Mary's days; and the better to assist him he supplied him with copies of all the letters, &c. that had passed upon the latter occasion, which letters may be seen in Strype.† A visitation of Cambridge was soon therefore set on foot, and, to copy Strype, "the visitors consisted of two learned Knights, SIR WILLIAM CECIL and Sir Anthony Cook; two Doctors of Divinity, Dr. PARKER and William Bill; two Doctors of the Civil Law, William May and Walter Haddon; one Doctor of Physic, Dr. Wendy; and two Professors of Divinity (as they are styled), Robert Horn and James Pilkington: all persons of great integrity and learning, and that had formerly been members of the said University."

In the mean while no small embarrassment arose, as might reasonably be expected, from the want of unanimity among the Reformists. The Protestants themselves were divided into parties, and severally attached to doctrines and peculiarities in discipline, more of foreign than of English growth. No sooner was it known abroad, that the reign of Mary was terminated, and Elizabeth advanced to the throne, than the refugees from all parts and places, *Zurich*, *Frankfort*, *Strasburgh*, *Basil*, *Wormes*, *Arrow*, &c. became impatient to return; efforts were made first to reconcile the differences that had hitherto divided them, but in vain; many returned with all their German prejudices about them, and as many with those that had prevailed in Switzerland. The former were for reducing matters to the model of the Lutheran Church, the latter to that of Geneva; the former stood ready with their Augustan Confession, which was held in some points to savour largely of Popery;‡ the latter were for

\* The Lord Keeper Bacon might of course be added.

† Life of Parker, 82—85.

‡ The Lutheran Church encouraged the use of altars, and the elevation of the Sacrament.

See *Collier*, ii. 434. see also *Strype*, *Annals*, vol. i. 76.

introducing the Genevan *discipline*, which bore hard upon Episcopacy. The Lutherans had indeed discarded transubstantiation, or the change of the elements in the Eucharist into the very body and blood of Jesus Christ, but they admitted consubstantiation, which was so like it, with regard to certain consequences, that the Genevans could never be brought to assent to it, while in discarding Episcopacy (which was no part of their discipline), and in quarrelling about habits, ceremonies, &c. they seemed evidently disposed to trench upon the liberty of such, as from the Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers, considered episcopal government to be of Divine origin,\* and habits and ceremonies, *αδιαφορα* or indifferents.

The Genevans, however, it may be observed, were willing to admit of King Edward's Reformation, sooner than have the Augustan Confession adopted, as may be seen by a letter still in existence, from Bullinger to Utenhovius, then at Frankfort (but in Edward's reign of the Dutch church in London), in which he laments the endeavours making to establish the Church of England on the Augustan Confession, and assuring him, that King Edward's Reformation satisfied *the godly*, that is, the Swiss congregation.† The Papists also were not displeased to see

\* Whoever would wish to see the sum of the testimony of the ancient Fathers to the *fact* of Episcopacy being the established government of the primitive Church, may consult Mr. Faber's *Difficulties of Romanism*, published in 1826, book ii. ch. 1. or Leslie's admirable discourse on the qualifications necessary to administer the Sacraments, with the supplement, in which all the citations from the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, may be seen at length. The Genevans, to do them justice, looked to the hierarchy as having remaining in it the seeds of Popery, such as they thought might facilitate a return to that exploded system; but the *Reformed Bishops* gave early security against any such dangers, by their able defence of the Church of England, and their jealousy of all foreign jurisdiction and interference, nor indeed were the Bishops under the Popish system by any means upon good terms with the Pope; the latter generally relying upon the monks, whom they had exempted from subjection to the Bishops, as a counterpoise against the latter. "One thing proposed as a ground of our Reformation," says a learned writer upon the subject, "was the retrieving the original rights of Bishops, which the Bishop of Rome had injuriously invaded, whilst he challenged the whole power of governing the Catholic Church, and making the Bishops only his curates."—*Barwick on the Church*, Belfast, 1813, 2d Edit. This author, in reply to those who were disposed to regard Episcopacy as a relic of Popery, observes, "This indeed is so far from being true, that I look on Episcopal Government as the best way to keep out Popery."—P. 80.

† This is certainly very remarkable, because during the Frankfort troubles, in the last reign, when Calvin had been applied to, to say what he thought of Edward's Liturgy, he found many faults in it, and thereby produced the schism in Germany, between those who were for making



some alterations made in the book of Common Prayer, and some resistance to the too rigid discipline of Geneva; so that, upon the petition against the Pope, in Edward's litany, being *thrown out*; on the sacerdotal dresses being, in some measure *retained*, and music *admitted* in the church solemnities, many shewed themselves not averse from joining in communion with the national church, and which, for the first ten years of the Queen's reign, they frequently attended. All this while, it should be considered, that upon the very principles of the Reformation, the Church of England was under no obligation to conform entirely to either party. She was equally at liberty to reject the authority of the Pope; to adopt so much only of the Augustan Confession as she might judge to be entirely consonant to the Scriptures; and to retain Episcopacy, as already sanctioned by the national church, upon what was supposed to be sacred or apostolical authority. The system she had to adopt might reasonably be regarded as an eclectic system,\* conformable in some measure to all, but no farther than the Scriptures, carefully examined and interpreted, might seem to warrant; and she had patterns to refer to *at home*. Had all the Marian exiles, when abroad, adhered to Edward's Reformation, no difficulties would have ensued from their return, but the disputes at Frankfort, among the exiles themselves, in the year 1556, plainly shewed that the English system stood a chance of being sacrificed for one of foreign growth.

Edward's Reformation the standard of belief for all the English exiles (Bishop Cox, the tutor of King Edward VI. being at the head of them); and those who did not hesitate to conform themselves rather to the Helvetian system, as Knox, Fox, &c., which, according to Neal, was the proper origin of Puritanism. Sir William Cecil's designs were evidently only to revive and restore Edward's Reformation, as Bullinger called it; he could therefore be no favourer of Calvin's objections or party. This is a material circumstance.

\* When, on the Queen's accession, the exiles at Geneva wrote to those at Frankfort to propose a reconciliation, and the former seemed still sore upon the subject of habits and ceremonies, it was very wisely and sensibly answered by the German exiles, that "as for ceremonies, the settling that point must neither be referred to the churches of Frankfort nor Geneva. The divines in England, with the concurrence of the Parliament, must put an end to that controversy. They hope the Reformation will recover and not be clogged with an over-weight of ceremonies, and therefore, provided nothing immoral is imposed, they are resolved to acquiesce in the public establishment, and wish their brethren of Geneva may be equally resigning; and since all the *Reformed abroad* differ in rites, and yet agree in doctrine, they see no reason why the English church may not be allowed the same latitude."—*Collier*, ii. 412. See also the address of the Germans to the English church, entitled *Germaniæ ad Angliam restitutæ Exangelii luce gratulatio*, in Strype's *Annals*, i. 156. and p. 161, Humphrey's tract, *de Religionis conservatione et reformatione verâ*, very applicable to the designs of the new government.

Cox interposed to prevent the secession, but in vain. For though he disturbed the seceding congregation at Frankfort, the dispersed members continued Calvinists.

The Secretary had to steer his course between all these parties; to keep all in good humour as far as he could, and to receive their secret representations and remonstrances, as the course of things might seem to affect them severally. Such communications may be said to have poured in upon him from all quarters, and to a degree scarcely credible, but by those who have been in the way to examine the contents of our several public libraries, and repositories (or merely the catalogues of the MSS. therein); and what began in the first year of the Queen's reign, seems to have continued with little intermission to the very end of his long and laborious life.

But it was impossible to keep the affairs of the Church clear of politics; the Reformation in all parts, had a bearing upon the civil as well as the ecclesiastical concerns of every state where it obtained a footing. England, at the time of Mary's death, having no ally but Philip (the CATHOLIC King, as his Ambassador in England took great care constantly to call him, especially in presence of the Queen, hoping thereby to deter her from any changes in the religion of the country), the Secretary very naturally looked to the PROTESTANT Princes of Germany, and, as we have before intimated, through the celebrated agent *Mount*, lost no time in sounding them, as to the support and assistance they might be disposed to afford the new Queen, and consulting them even as to the marriage of the latter, if such a bond of alliance could be suggested. The Princes were ready to receive the Queen into the Smalcaldic league, if she would carry on the Reformation upon their model, and they proposed as a match for Elizabeth, the very Archduke Charles, of whom we have before spoken.

But while the Secretary was thus seeking a Protestant alliance (and we may add an Anti-Gallican alliance), as more suitable to the views of the Queen in regard to religion, the Helvetian divines became jealous of the advances he seemed to be making towards the *Lutherans*, and were by no means satisfied with the first appearances of things on their return from their voluntary exile.\* We

\* Knox had done the exiles from Geneva no small injury by his imprudent book against "the monstrous regiment and empire of Women;" originally aimed at Mary of England, and Mary of Lorraine, but Elizabeth's accession naturally altered the case, and Knox tried to get out of the scrape; though rather awkwardly, as may be seen by his letters to Secretary *Cecil* and to the

have much of very curious information upon this head preserved in the letters of the celebrated Bishop Jewel, who was among the first to return; they are chiefly addressed to Peter Martyr, the very person to whom the returned exiles seem to have generally applied for counsel and advice; and with reason, as he had borne so great a share in the revolutions of the preceding reigns. The letters are of course all written in Latin, and we shall therefore only extract a few passages, as particularly explanatory of the state of things in the first year of the Queen's reign, as they appeared to this justly eminent and amiable divine; he was certainly, it must be confessed, more in a hurry, than accorded with the cautious proceedings of the Queen and her Council.

His first letter is dated from Strasburgh, and gives an account of the departure of Sandys and Horn, and the favourable reception the Queen gave them on their arrival in England,\* of the paucity of Bishops, fourteen sees being by that time, in all likelihood, vacant. He notices White's intemperate sermon at Mary's funeral, and the Queen's inhibition of the preachers, Romish and Reformed, for which different reasons had been assigned.

His next letter written to Peter Martyr, March 29, 1559, after his own arrival in England, expresses the great disappointment he felt, at first, to find every thing as it was, still in the hands of the Papists; the Pope's authority still allowed; no return to the reformed doctrines or discipline, masses in abundance, the same pomp and insolence on the part of the Popish Bishops. "Nondum enim ejectus erat Romanus pontifex; nondum pars ulla Religionis restituta; eadem erat ubique missarum proluvia, eadem pompa et insolentia Episcoporum." But things were beginning to get better and to mend rapidly. "Ista tamen omnia nunc tandem mutare incipiunt et pene ruere." Still he complains largely of the conduct and power of the Bishops in Parliament: *i. e.* the Romish Bishops who still sat in the House of Lords. "Magno nobis impedimento sunt Episcopi:" and he laments that there should be none there capable

Queen.—*Strype's Annals*, i. 178, 179. Knox was ably answered by Ælmer (Aylmer), afterwards Bishop of London, *ib.* 181. See, for an account of his book, the *Life of the Bishop by Strype*, ch. xii.—it was written while he was yet an exile, and printed at Strasburgh, 1559.

\* He might have added *Grindal* as among the first to return; during Mary's reign there can be no doubt but that many kept their eyes upon the exiles abroad, to whose necessities they administered, in a private and secret manner, and chiefly through the hands of *Grindal*.—See *Strype's Life of that Prelate*, p. 30. The exiles in general appear to have come home upon some *secret intimations*, to use *Strype's* own words, of a renewal of the Reformation.



of answering them; “qui illorum fucos et mendacia possit, coram dicendo refutare,” is his strong expression; as we have noticed these speeches before, given them such credit as they deserve, and accounted for their receiving no answers, the subjects discussed being beyond the reading and knowledge of the temporal lords, and no Protestant Bishops having yet obtained seats in the House; we shall only observe, that the term *mendacia*, is most applicable to the speech of Feckenham, who had grossly slandered and misrepresented some of the early Reformers, both foreign and English, but of the latter, very particularly Cranmer and Ridley.

The Queen, he goes on to remark, openly favoured their cause, but was checked and hindered, partly by her own Council, and partly by the endeavours of the Spanish minister, “Comite *Terio*,” (probably the Conde de *Feria*), to prevent any innovations; he still gives her credit, and consequently her Council, for proceeding prudently, resolutely, and piously. “*Illa tamen quamvis lentius aliquanto quam nos velimus, tamen et prudenter, et fortiter et piè persequitur institutum.*”

He next notices the appointed disputation between the Popish and Protestant Divines, and gives so good a reason for it, that we cannot avoid transcribing it. “*Interea ne Episcopi nostri queri possint se potentia tantum, et lege esse victos, res revocata est in disputationem;*” i. e. Lest the Bishops (Popish Bishops) should complain or allege, that they had been violently or by mere force of law, subdued, &c.—In this letter he gives a sad account of the conduct and behaviour of certain of the Popish Prelates or Dignitaries, ending with *Weston* (the Prolocutor of the Convocation, when *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Latimer* were so roughly handled at Oxford, and so cruelly condemned), who was actually put out of his preferments, for his horrible licentiousness.\* “*De Westono audisti antea, sed quid istos, inquires commemoros? ut intelligas quibus iudiciis oportuerit B. Cranmerum, P. Ridlæum, P. Latimerum condemnari.*”

In a letter to Bullinger, May 22, 1559, he deplores the wretched state of the Universities, particularly Oxford, where “*vix duo*,” scarcely two, he thinks, could be found to favour their cause, so much had the place been corrupted by

\* *Weston* was in the Tower when Elizabeth first came to London from Hatfield, and obliged to be removed, for her accommodation, to the Savoy, where he shortly after died.—See as to this man, and all the proceedings against Cranmer, &c. our first volume.

Spanish Friars.\* To Péter Martyr again, April 6, 1559, he writ a long account of the disputation in which he himself bore a conspicuous part, and which he says, was intended to have been conducted with as much solemnity as possible, before the Privy Council, and members of both houses of Parliament, but which the extreme anger, intemperance, and unreasonable objections of the papistical party, had caused to be brought to a premature termination; not however before the Reformists had, by the almost general consent of the assembly, obtained a notable victory, by the reading of Horn's paper, and he mentions particularly the Earl of Shrewsbury who had readily acknowledged this. "*Postremo ita dimissa est disputatio ut vix quisquam esset, in toto illo conventu, ne Comes quidem Salopiensis, quin Victoriam illius diei adjudicaret nobis.*" He also observes to his learned correspondent, that it was almost incredible how much the conduct of this disputation had lessened, in the opinion of the people, the fame and credit of the Popish Bishops.

In August 1559, nine months after the Queen's accession, he writes in better spirits to Peter Martyr—"Res nostræ satis *nunc* sunt in proclivi—Regina optime animatur; Populus ubique sitiens religionis." This, it should be observed, was after the English Service Book had been restored to the churches.† He speaks as promisingly of Scotland, though with less moderation than we could wish, and with but little foresight of the protracted struggle she had yet to undergo. "*Monasteria passim omnia æquantur solo, vestes Scenicæ, calices sacrilegi, idola, altaria comburuntur; ne vestigia quidem priscæ superstitionis et idolatriæ relinquuntur.*" He informs him that several of the vacant sees had been filled up, himself "*minimus apostolorum,*" as he modestly speaks, being nominated and chosen Bishop of Salisbury. He mentions the peace concluded with France, and the shuffling engagement to

\* The early choice of Sir William Cecil to be Chancellor of Cambridge, bespeaks a different state of things there, though I have seen the passage so cited as to affect both Universities; while it is extremely certain, that in the original the *vix duo* are particularly restrained to *Oxford*.—Compare Strype's Annals, i. Records, no. xx. p. 490, with the Vindication of the Church established by Elizabeth, p. 16, note.—In the latter instance the important word "*Oxonix*" is actually left out, at which we are the more surprised, because that book being written in reply to Neal, we find it to be a remark of the latter, even under the year 1563, that things were so bad at *Oxford*, that only three Protestant preachers were to be found there, and they were all Puritans.

† St. John Baptist's day, viz. June 24, was the day fixed for the English service to begin, but it appears to have been performed earlier in the Queen's Chapel, May 12, and June 6, at Windsor, at St. George's feast; at St. Paul's also on St. Barnabas' day, June 11.

surrender Calais in eight years. He notices the Queen's objection to be called the Head of Church, which he acknowledges gave him no displeasure.\* He announces the safe arrival of a book of Peter Martyr's sent as a present to the Queen, and which he tells him had been duly presented to her Majesty by Sir William Cecil, "*redditus est a D. Cæcilio.*" He mentions in a letter, November 5, 1559, how much the Queen asked about him (Peter Martyr), and seemed desirous of having him in England;† and on the 15th of November, the last day but one of the first year of the Queen's reign, he repeats, how much, and by how many, his presence was desired, though the state of affairs was so unsettled that he could not urge him to be in any haste to come. Lastly, in the same letter, he notices the favourable disposition of the Secretary towards them; "*CÆCILIIUS causæ nostræ impense favit.*"

We have not particularly noticed one great trait of Sir William's statesmanly talents, displayed in this very first year of the Queen's reign, we mean the amendment of the coin. We have in our former volume given an account of the extraordinary depreciations it underwent in the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Mary; it belonged to Sir William Cecil, to bring it to a standard of purity and perfection, which may be said to have cast a lustre on the whole reign of his prudent and wise Sovereign. In his *Life by a Domestic*, we have the following account of his principles and opinions, regarding this great point of political economy; and as it is accompanied with a short summary of his ministerial labours during this first and ensuing year of the Queen's reign, we shall transcribe it at length, with Mr. Peck's additions, corrections, or emendations.‡

\* The oath of Supremacy had been misconstrued, as if it claimed for the Sovereign a power of *ministry* in the Church. This the Queen was anxious to clear up, and make it understood, that she claimed no more, than "under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these realms, dominions, and countries, either ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no foreign power ought to have any superiority over them."—*Collier*, ii. 433. In the Queen's Injunctions, set forth in 1559, an explanatory clause was introduced to the above effect, as we before observed. These Injunctions, framed probably by the select company of divines employed about the Liturgy, were reviewed, and in some instances corrected by *Cecil's* own hand.

† Peter Martyr was at this time rather angry with the Queen, as may be seen in *Strype's Life of Grindal*, 48. He had written to her, it seems, twice, but his letters had no notice taken of them; he was offended with her for leaning towards the Augustan Confession, which was likely to encourage her in setting up the Crucifix; which the exiles from Geneva heartily wished her to lay aside.—See how much stress was laid upon this in *Jewel's*, *Sandys'* and *Sampson's* letters, *Burnet*, iii. part ii. Nos. 60, 61, 63.

‡ His notes from *Stone* and *Holinshed* should be consulted.



“After he had endeavoured to bring the health of the soule” (alluding to the disputations by which the cause of Protestantism was so much advanced), “he next laboured for the wealth of the state, for by his pollitique advice, the coigne and mony’s of the realme were brought to the standard of fyneness now currant in England, from the former baseness ; beinge nowe one of the richest coins of the world : to the great inriching of this realm and Commonwealth.\*

“For he held a position (which undoubtedly is true) viz. that, ‘That realme cannot be rich whose coin is poore or base.’ And he would also saie, ‘*Oportet Patrem familias magis esse vendacem quam emacem.*’ [That a prince ought rather to be a seller, than a buyer, seeing] that realme must needs be poore, that carrieth not out more than it bringeth in.”

Speaking next of his mission to Scotland, to procure a peace, of which we shall soon have to give an account, and of his general disposition to avoid war, whenever it could be safely and honourably avoided, the author thus sums up the three great points to which Sir William’s attention was primarily, and with such good success, directed.

\* “To Queen Elizabeth it is to be ascribed,” says Camden, “that there hath been better and purer money in England than was seen in two hundred years before, or hath been elsewhere in use throughout all Europe.”—“This certainly was a great and memorable act, which neither King Edward the Sixth could, nor Queen Mary durst do, after that King Henry VIII. had first of all the Kings of England, mixed the money with brass, to the great dishonour of the kingdom, and the damage of his successors and people.” In our first volume, Ch. xxix. pp. 397, 8. we have touched upon this subject as far as regarded the reigns of Henry and Edward ; in the 5th year of the reign of the latter, the debasement of our money appears to have reached its lowest point. As Lord Burghley was then in place, and highly conversant with the subject, we may be sure that what he did so soon for his present Sovereign, in conformity to his own maxim, he would have done for Edward, had his power then been equal to his will ; it is a strong proof indeed of the rapacity of those, who may be said to have usurped the reins of government, we mean Northumberland and his party, and with them the blame should rest. How soon after Elizabeth’s accession, the project was set in motion for amending the coin, we may judge from the Lord Paget’s letter to Sir Thomas Parry and the Secretary, to be seen in Haynes, sent with two devices or plans for the new coinage, and in which he observes, “If the Queen’s Majesty amend the coin universally, there shall grow thereby great commodity to her and the realm ; and also the greatest honour and reputation in the world, that ever came, not only to any Princess, but at any time to any King of this realm.” This letter is dated on the 3d of February, 1558, three months only after the accession. From Lord Burghley’s own notes, it would appear to have been about the 29th of May, 1561, that the business of the mint was completed : “May 29th, Base monies decayed, and fine silver coined.”—See also *Strype’s Annals*, i. 395-6. “Though Elizabeth restored the standard, she sometimes reduced the weight of the currency, and was only prevented making greater changes, by the firmness and sagacity of Lord Burghley.”—See *Edinburgh Review*, No. xiv.

“Of which three last points, *viz.* The alteration of religion, change of our coignes, and turning troubles into peace, if you enter into the difficulties of effecting them, and the vertues of their effects, they will all give you pregnant proofs of his wisdom, pollicie, and paines. The first thought almost impossible, and unlikely to be done so quietly and quickly. That religion, for which all the world make war, should be so soon changed, reformed and established with peace! that our base coins should be turned into rich monys! and that our troubles were now pacified, and peace perfected, which poured plenty into our land! and so by one man’s labour, all these blessings to be brought us at once! [that is to say] Religion the life of the soule! rich moncys the synews of our strength! and peace the harvest of our labors, and fountaine of our wealth! These three great things, to be so easily and speedily compassed, as is notably manifest; principally by his means and industrie; I leave it to the world to judge, whether, working them at the first, and contynnuing them to the last, evene ’till his death, doe not prove the author a wise and a worthy man? for the like to be done, in the like manner, hath seldom bene seen.”

Towards the conclusion of this first year of the Queen’s reign, a proclamation against excess of apparel appeared, upon which a certain Prelate in a discourse from the pulpit, enumerating many of the prevailing *vanities*, has given us a curious specimen of the fashions and *luxuries* of the day, in the following extraordinary passage.

“These fine-fingered rufflers, with their sables about their necks, corked slippers, trimmed buskins and warm mittens,—furred stomachers, long gowns; these tender parnells must have one gown for the day, another for the night: one long, another short: one for winter, another for summer: one furred through, and another but faced: one for the work-day, another for the holy-day: one of this colour, another of that: one of cloth, another of silk or damask. Change of apparel; one afore dinner, another at after; one of Spanish fashion, another of Turkey: and to be brief, never content with enough, but always devising new fashions and strange. Yea, a *ruffian*\* will have more in his ruff and his hose, than he should spend in a year; he which ought to go in a russet coat, spends as much on apparel for him and his wife, as his father would have kept a good horse with.”

We shall conclude our account of this first year of this memorable reign, with the following passage from the history of Elizabeth, by *Mademoiselle*

\* Wearer of *ruffs*.

*Keralio.* After enumerating the important changes that took place, and by which she says, “la face de l’ Angleterre fut changée dans quelques mois ;” she adds, “ Telles furent les operations d’ une femme, de vingt-cinq ans ; jusqu’ alors ou prisonnière ou ensevelie dans une profonde solitude ; qui, sans experience dans l’ art de gouverner, prenoit les rênes de l’ empire, dans un temps où tout, au dedans et au dehors, étoit dangereux. Avant l’ année revôlue, elle avoit affranchi ses etats du joug Espagnol, rétabli les loix promulguées par Henri VIII. et son fils, fait la paix avec la France et l’ Ecosse, soumis l’ ambition, et fixé les opinions. Une profonde prudence avoit créé ce grand ouvrage ; une fermeté inébranlable la défendit contre l’ intrigue, et ne permit jamais qu’ on y portât la plus légère atteinte ;” without wishing to detract from the compliment paid to Elizabeth personally, we must be allowed to claim for Lord Burghley, his just share of credit ; particularly on the score of *experience, prudence, firmness, and resolution.*



## CHAP. II.

1560.

Second year of Queen Elizabeth's reign began November 17, 1559.\*

*Duke of Norfolk and Lord Gray sent to the North—Knox's Character—Alteration in the conduct and disposition of the Queen Regent of Scotland—Mary Queen of Scots' family, the occasion of her troubles—Important Papers, drawn up by Cecil, on the aspect of affairs, particularly in regard to Scotland, with the conclusions drawn from them—Peace of Cambray, a fallacious peace—Maxims of defence—Lords of Congregation, their views—Lethington's famous Letter—Proceedings with Scotland from Lord B.'s Notes—Lords of Congregation's Address to the Regent, with her reply—The Conquest of Scotland aimed at by France—Application of Protestants to Elizabeth—Elizabeth in danger of being beguiled—Account of Knox—Earl of Arran—Practices against England—Address to the Queen Regent from the Camp of the Confederates—Military operations in Scotland—Du Glasion, Spanish Minister, and Cecil's Answer to him in Latin—Duplicity of the French—Cook's Account of the English Ministers—Account of Monluc—Elizabeth's Proclamation against the Guises—Guises' notice of it—Spanish Interposition—Papers by Knollys and Du Glasion—Intimation to Du Glasion of the Queen's Proceedings—Letters to Lady Cecil—Cecil sets off for Scotland—The Guises occupied with the conspiracy of Amboise—Letters from Cecil and Wotton—Progress of the Negotiation—Treaty of Edinburgh signed and proclaimed—Return of Cecil—Affairs of the Church—Lent season still observed—Archbishop Parker's order for serving the Cures—Cecil's Article.*

ON the very day on which the Queen entered into the second year of her reign, we find the following entry in Lord Burghley's own notes :

“Nov. 17, anno 2d. Eliz. Consultation for order of the realm, viz. Duke of Norfolk to be Lieutenant in the North, Lord Gray, Lord Warden in the East

\* So many histories of the XVIth Century, and particularly of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, are extant in the form of *Annals*, that we have judged it expedient to follow the example set us, and to place at the head of every Chapter, or Section of the present Work, the date of the *Year*, according to the *Calendar* ; not omitting to mark at the same time, the beginning of the *Annus Regni* ; so many important events and transactions (as the *meetings*, *sessions*, and *acts* of *Parliament* in particular), being regulated by the latter ; at the hazard of no small confusion, unless

Marches." There was nothing certainly so much to be looked to as the northern frontier of the realm, and the state of Scotland, where it was impossible not to know that much was in contemplation, and much even in preparation against England; for the French forces, after the peace, had never been withdrawn, and the death of Henry II. of France, had thrown so much power into the hands of the *Guises*, or Princes of the house of Lorrain, brothers to the *Queen Dowager of Scotland*, as very naturally to raise an apprehension that they would lose no opportunity of procuring the Crown of England, for their niece, by means of Scotland unless timely checked in their purposes and designs. Fortunately for Elizabeth and for England, the Scotch were not in a state of unanimity. The Reformation had made great progress there, in the last years of Mary of England,\* and even the Queen Dowager herself, had been driven by circumstances to unite herself with the nobles, and others who favoured the Reformation. She had in short been thwarted in her purposes by the Hamiltons, particularly the Archbishop of St. Andrews, brother to the Regent *Arran*; who, foreseeing that in case of the demise of the young Queen, his nephew might the more easily succeed, the governor his father being already in possession, had earnestly opposed the conferring the *Crown Matrimonial*† on Francis, and got the most part of the

some care be taken to mark the difference. The *Annus Regni* of Queen Elizabeth's reign, may be held constantly to begin on the 17th day of the month of November, leaving 45 days only to the commencement of a new year, according to the historical reckoning, beginning January 1; and about 128 according to the civil reckoning, beginning on the 25th of March. In both cases it will be seen, that by much the larger portion of the *Annus Regni* will concur with the common date of the year. Thus 1560 may reasonably be placed at the head of the Chapter containing the transactions of the 2d year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, though according to one reckoning 45 days, and according to the other 128, may appear rather to belong to the year 1559. We shall have occasion hereafter to shew, what strange mistakes have occurred from a want of attention to this variety of dates and reckonings.

\* See Vol. i. chap. lxiv.

† The grant of the Crown Matrimonial, would have made Francis King of Scotland for life; if the succession of the kingdom could have been as the French intended, brought under the rule of private inheritances in Scotland, whereby, according to what was called the *Courtesy of Scotland*, whoever married an heiress was to keep possession during life, of his wife's property, if she died without children. We may form some judgment of the overbearing influence of the French, and bad policy of their friends in Scotland, or rather their want of *patriotism*, by this very circumstance of the Crown Matrimonial; when only three years earlier the English had been wise enough to exclude Philip II. from all claim to the English Crown, in case Mary should die without children, and it might be added that, by their endeavour to bring the case of the Crown

clergy on his side. This threw the Queen Dowager, for some time, into the hands of the Reformed party, which, by her conniving at their preaching, and favouring them in many other ways, had greatly increased about that time in all parts. We have seen the account which Jewel sent to his correspondents abroad, and though things had not gone yet quite so far as he represents, yet it cannot be doubted, but that at this time the Reformation had made considerable progress in Scotland. Burnet acknowledges that Popery was the object of all men's hatred: the churches were purged from idolatry and superstition; the monasteries were broken into; and many acts of hot and irregular zeal were complained of in all corners of the kingdom.

They had indeed at their head a reformer (Knox) as bold and dauntless as Martin Luther; rough but sincere; who seemed to have no object in view but the rooting out *idolatry*—with *that* he would keep no terms. It was one of the powers of darkness with which he was resolved to wage war wherever he found it; crowns and sceptres could not stop his course; where he could not convert, he seemed almost ready to destroy: but this was not so in reality. We have indeed a remarkable testimony to a forbearance on the part of the Scottish reformers, even in the midst of their most tumultuous movements. Bishop Leslie has gone rather out of his way to *acknowledge* that the multitude was generally under such restraint that, in the greatest heat of popular fury, there was no blood shed; very few of the Catholics were driven into exile, and fewer still imprisoned; the passage is curious: “*Nobilium qui hæreseas obstringebantur crimine, humanitas non est reticenda, quod eo tempore paucos catholicos de religionis re mulctarint exilio, pauciores carcere, morte NULLOS.*”\*

This testimony to the *humanity* of the Reformers, may serve to shew, that had the Reformation been permitted to take its course in Scotland, as merely a *national* concern, clear of *foreign* interference, it is possible that all the violences committed afterwards might have been avoided. But as soon as ever the eyes of the Reformed party came to be opened as to the true character and aims of the Queen Regent, as the instrument of France, for so she allowed herself to be made, it must have become extremely evident, that those who had

within the rules of private inheritance, they were virtually oversetting the claims of their niece upon England; the laws of private inheritance being there entirely against her claims, as not born in England, nor of parents in obedience to the English Crown, as has before been shewn.

\* In the tumults at *Perth* in 1559, the people appear to have been in like manner restrained from plunder. See upon this Cook, vol. ii. 81, who properly corrects Collier.



espoused the cause of the Reformation, would have to contend, not merely for liberty of conscience, but for the ancient rights and liberties of their native country, likely to be surrendered to the wiles and machinations of a foreign usurper. The Queen Dowager had no sooner found means to get the Regency out of the hands of Arran,\* than she threw aside the mask, and became an immediate instrument in the hands of her brothers of Lorrain, to root out heresy, and in virtue of her daughter's sovereignty, to deliver over the kingdom of Scotland, as it would seem, to the dominion of France. It is scarcely possible to put any other construction on the measures she is known to have taken. But with regard to the time of which we are writing, it is confidently asserted that immediately after the conclusion of the peace of Cambray, she received intelligence from the Cardinal of Lorrain, by the hands of *M. Bettoncourt*, master of his household, that, by a secret convention, the Pope, the Emperor, and the Kings of Spain and France, *had agreed* to unite their forces, and to exert the utmost of their power, to reduce *all Europe* again under the authority of the Roman see, and to pursue and punish with fire and sword, all heretics who would not submit to the same. It deserves to be considered also, that at this very period, the French had, according to very credible accounts, taken such advantage of the tender years of the young Queen of Scotland, as to induce her privately to execute three deeds, whereby, in default of issue, she absolutely conferred on the Crown of France the whole kingdom of Scotland, with whatever *inheritance or succession might accrue to it*.† Robertson justly and properly acquits the young

\* The Regent Arran was entirely under the control of his more subtle brother, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, who, as it has been shewn, wished to keep the Crown Matrimonial from Francis, and the Regency in his own hands, that in case any thing should happen to Mary, the Crown might devolve at once to his brother or nephew, but the Archbishop happening to be seized with a severe illness, so severe, that, as it has been said, he would have died but for the assistance of the celebrated *Cardan*, the Queen Dowager seized the opportunity, in conjunction with the French Court, to procure the resignation of the Regency into her own hands. The Archbishop's recovery gave some check to these proceedings, which induced the Queen a second time to court and humour the Protestants, but as the latter disliked Arran, they supported her in her designs, and even assisted her in procuring at last such a resignation of the trust, as led to a parliamentary settlement of the Regency in her hands, April, 1554.

† Dr. Cook, in his history of the Scottish Reformation, gives the following account of this dark transaction—"Under this apparent candour of the French Court, there was concealed the most artful and detestable dissimulation; at the very time in which the liberties of Scotland, and the eventual succession of the family of Hamilton to the Crown, were, as the Scottish Commissioners

Queen of being a party in this dark transaction ; since, from the names and exalted stations of those more deeply concerned in it, it is evident that they were only practising upon her inexperience, and natural deference for her foreign relatives. The King of France himself, the Keeper of the Great Seal, the Duke of Guise, and the Cardinal of Lorrain, were the principal and immediate agents in this scene of iniquity ; for it was to be kept *concealed* from Mary's *own subjects* in every way possible. Surely, the worst enemies that Mary ever had, were those who thus exposed her in her earliest years, to the just suspicions and political jealousies, not only of a powerful neighbour, but of the most patriotic of her own people.† Their *mode* of proceeding was injurious in every way possible to her future happiness ; that she and her family had been passed over by Henry VIII. in his strange settlement of the succession, was, we must allow, sufficient to irritate her feelings when old enough to reflect on such things ; but let her claims by blood have been what they might, Elizabeth came before her, on the ground of a Parliamentary conveyance of the Crown, the cordial reception and acknowledgment of her subjects, and a fair claim to be regarded as a legitimate daughter of Henry, by all who considered his espousal of Queen Katherine to have been contrary to the law of God, and therefore not to be dispensed with by any power upon earth. But in the way the French Court asserted Mary's claim, as it evidently proceeded upon two grounds, disallowed in England ; first, the insufficiency of Henry's settlement, and secondly, the validity of his marriage in virtue of a Popish dispensation,—they must have appeared to be defying and insulting both Elizabeth and *England*, plainly bastardising the former, after having left Mary unmolested ; disputing Henry's will, though sanctioned by Parliament ; and probably through a knowledge of England's crippled state, too clearly discovering their design of immediately taking into

believed, sincerely confirmed, Mary was induced to subscribe deeds totally inconsistent with both, by which she conveyed her kingdom in free gift to the King of France, if she should leave no children ; and declared, that whatever confirmation she might, in compliance with the wishes of Parliament, give to the lineal succession, the deeds which she had executed expressed her real sentiments and intentions." Copies of these treacherous deeds are stated to be in the Advocate's library, we have ourselves seen such in the British Museum, tending so strongly to confirm the fact, as to leave no doubt in our minds of the truth of the alleged contract.

• "Les Guises," says Mademoiselle Keralio, "enviroient cette Princesse [*Marie Stuart*] du poison de la flatterie, et environnoient sa jeunesse des songes d'ambition, tandis que, par les mains de sa mere, ils lui preparoient une vie affreuse, et une mort plus cruelle encore."—*Histoire d' Elisabeth*. 1560.

their hands the entire government of Scotland, to resist the Reformation there, and place its young Sovereign in a state of positive hostility to all the Protestants on both sides of the Tweed as well as to Elizabeth, as an usurper of a Crown which more justly belonged to herself.

We may now therefore turn to the proceedings of the English Government, thus early called into action, to keep the Crown on the head of Elizabeth, and her kingdom from invasion, by a foe, who had a design on the whole island; for England was certainly regarded by the French Court at this time, as no other than an *inheritance* and *succession accruing to Scotland*, if it could but once obtain entire dominion over the latter country.

It may be considered indeed extremely fortunate for England, that the French intrigues, the duplicity of the Queen Dowager, the presence of a foreign army, and the dangers to which Protestantism was thereby exposed, should have brought things to a sort of crisis, exactly at the period of Elizabeth's accession to the Crown of England. It is seldom that the commencement of a reign requires such an immediate exertion of political talents as was the case in this instance. Every thing was found to depend, not on the military strength of the kingdom (that was shaken and enfeebled); not on any immediate command of money, for the Treasury was miserably low; but on a promptness to remedy and repair, what would in all likelihood be so soon wanted, and in the meantime a sagacity to foresee and take account of all the dangers that threatened; to ward off, as discreetly as possible, such as were most apparent, and to penetrate and counteract such as were preparing in secret.\*

The Queen Regent, and the Reformed party, had now for some time been at variance. They had even had recourse to arms; not however without many attempts, by treaties, conventions, and truces, to bring things to a more amicable arrangement, but in vain. On the Regent's side, the truces were broken, the treaties violated, and as she became more deceitful, she became more proud. She was not destitute of talents, nor yet of virtues, but she was a mere tool in the hands of her brothers, who sent French soldiers to support her, French counselors to advise her, and French ministers to encourage her, in all she did; even French ecclesiastics to dispute with the Protestants. The true interests of *Scotland* appeared to be forgotten; all who were on *her* side were regarded by their

\* See Throckmorton's Letters from France to the Queen, Sir William Cecil, Leicester, &c, *passim*; and Millot's *Histoire Moderne*, tom. ii. époque xi. ch. iii.



Protestant countrymen as in the interests of *France*; all who were opposed to her were regarded by the French and their Catholic adherents as *heretics*.\*

In this posture of affairs, whither could any true patriots look for help, if their own strength should appear to fail? they were in danger of being hunted down as heretics, and as for any communication with their own Queen, it was utterly impossible, but through the medium of such, as they had but too much reason given them to regard as no better than foreign foes. Having helped the Queen to the Regency, they seemed to think they had a right to depose her, when her actions seemed to take a turn entirely adverse to the liberties of their native country. They took this step, therefore, and by that means placed themselves evidently in hostile association, as far as regarded the Regency and the interference of the French; though certainly not necessarily so, as far as respected their proper Sovereign, had she been more independent, or in *better hands*.† They may have

\* Nothing could well be more irritating than Mary's conduct towards the Protestants. Twice had she turned to them for support against the Hamiltons, who kept the clergy from siding with the French, but when she had attained her end, of attaching the Popish clergy to her cause, worked upon by their fears of the spreading of the Reformation, she treated those Protestants with the most unbecoming pride; resented their interference; made a mockery of her own engagements to them; and almost necessarily compelled them to renounce entirely, if not their allegiance to Mary, their obedience to such a tyrannous power as she evidently assumed, as the Regent of their own making. That she was goaded on to do this there can be no doubt, but she did it more ungraciously than might have been expected, from the preceding traits of her character, though dissimulation seems constantly to have been one of her greatest foibles, as we have before had occasion to remark; and indeed we are much disposed to agree entirely with Dr. McCrie, in what he has advanced upon the subject, in his *Life of Knox*, Period VI. and in the valuable note F. F. vol. i. p. 431.

† It is well known that Willock and Knox were consulted upon this point, as ministers of the Gospel; and as the Calvinistic school, at Geneva, is pretty generally held to have inculcated principles of government, if not entirely republican, very adverse to the indefeasible rights of hereditary monarchs, we ought, perhaps, in justice to Knox, to mention the three conditions upon which he held that the *Regent*, in this case, might be suspended. First, that they did not suffer the misconduct of the Queen Regent to alienate their affections from due allegiance to their Sovereigns, Francis and Mary; secondly, that they were not actuated in the measure by private hatred or envy of the Queen Dowager, but by regard for the safety of the commonwealth; and thirdly, that any sentence they should pronounce, at this time, should not preclude her re-admission to the office, if she afterwards discovered sorrow for her conduct, and a disposition to submit to the advice of the counsellors of the kingdom.—See McCrie's *Life of Knox*, i. 299, (with note K. K. on the loyalty of the Scottish Protestants) and the remarks following, p. 301, on the general question of the behaviour of subjects towards rulers abusing their power. We must remember that the securities enjoyed in this country, against the abuses of power in the Crown, were not then known or

felt, as Rapin seems to hint, that in the eyes of the French Court, they could not but appear, not merely as unfit tools, to be drawn into the project of dethroning a Protestant Queen, who was establishing their religion in England, but even as the greatest possible obstacles to such a project.\* They may have felt averse even from assisting so to extend the dominions of Mary, if she were to continue Catholic, and in the hands of so notoriously bigoted a family, as her maternal relations of the house of Lorrain; in short, it would be difficult to say what other expedient could have suggested itself to their minds, but that of applying to Elizabeth for English succour and support.

An application of this nature seems to have been one of the first questions submitted to the judgment of Sir William *Cecil*;† and which led to the very

understood. See Blackstone, b. i. c. 7. upon the subject of the above note; however, the reader would do well to consult Collier, ii. 459. Bayle, Art. Knox, notes D. and E. and Kenney's Principles of the Reformers.

\* Robertson concludes this to have been so obvious to the French, as to be the motive of the most cruel persecutions, could they but have taken effect. "It was vain," says he, "to expect the assistance of the Scottish Protestants to dethrone a Queen, whom all Europe esteemed the guardian and defender of the Reformed faith. To break the power and reputation of that party in Scotland, became for this reason a necessary step towards the invasion of England, with this the Princes of Lorrain resolved to open their schemes, and as persecution was the only method for suppressing religions known in that age, or dictated by the despotic and sanguinary spirit of the Romish superstition; this, in its utmost violence, they determined to employ. The Earl of Argyle, the Prior of St. Andrew's, and other leaders of the party, were marked out by them for immediate destruction; and they hoped, by punishing them, to intimidate their followers." That these measures were, in some degree checked, he attributes to the remonstrances of that humane and sagacious princess, the Regent. We would withhold from this lady no just commendation; we are willing to admit that she possessed both humanity and sagacity, but her deference to her brothers led her to submit her own judgment too far in this arduous business, to their impetuous zeal; it even appeared to have totally altered her character, from affable she became morose; from condescending, proud; instead of seeking to reconcile parties, she began to set the Protestants wholly at defiance; to keep no faith with them; to threaten them as *heretics*; and upon the rashly avowed principle, that *Princes' promises were not always to be holden*.

† Knox, on his return to Scotland, in May 1559, soon saw the necessity of uniting Elizabeth and the Congregation in one confederacy to oppose the French; he plainly saw that France had resolved on the conquest of England as well as Scotland, and that England ought to see this; and he mentioned it to Kirkaldy of Grange, who wrote to Sir Harry Percy, afterwards Earl of Northumberland, and in a subsequent interview, pressed it so forcibly upon him, that the latter conceived it to be his duty at once to submit the proposals of the Congregation to *Cecil*, "the enlightened and able secretary of Elizabeth. This profound statesman," Dr. Cook goes on to say,

curious and important memorials which we have now to copy, in which attention must still be paid to the injurious designs of the French, against the liberties, the laws, and ancient rights of *both* countries. The two papers seem to have been drawn up in the month of August, of the first year of the Queen's reign, though not acted upon till the commencement of the second year.

The first is entitled a Memorial of certain points meet for restoring the realm of Scotland to the ancient weale. The date is August 5, 1559, and is taken from a copy in Secretary *Cecil's* hand-writing, Cotton Library, Cal. B. x. fol. 17.

"Imprimis,\* it is to be noted, that the best worldly felicity that Scotland can have, is either to continue in a perpetual peace with the kingdom of England, or to be made one monarchy with England, as they both make but one island, divided from the rest of the world.

"If the first is sought, that is, to be in perpetual peace with England, then must it necessarily be provided, that Scotland be not so subject to the appointments of France, as is presently, which being an ancient enemy to England, seeketh always to make Scotland an instrument to exercise thereby their malice upon England, and to make a footstool thereof to look over England as they may. Therefore, when Scotland shall come into the hands of a mere Scottish man in blood, then may there be hope of such accord; but as long as it is at the *commandment of the French* there is no hope to have accord long betwixt these two realms.

"Therefore seeing it is at the French King's commandment by reason of his

"aware of what might be the result of the application which had been made by Percy, laid his communication before the Council." This appears to have occurred in July, and the papers were prepared in August.

\* "This memorial," says Dr. Cook, "is written with great ability, displays profound political knowledge, and is full of the justest sentiments respecting the real interests of Scotland."—Vol. ii. 214. Had the political life of Lord Burghley began with the reign of Elizabeth, as some pretend, it might reasonably be asked, how came he to be so well acquainted with the real interests of both kingdoms, and to be able to display such profound knowledge in only the very first year of her reign. This very paper may be said to embrace all the politics of England with regard to Scotland, from the days of Henry VIII. when he was scandalously cheated, as we shall always think, out of his projected matrimonial union of the two kingdoms, which the Scotch are too prone to regard, as a profligate design to bring Scotland into subjection, not considering that the marrying Mary to the Dauphin of France, instead of Edward, threatened the subjection of the whole island to a foreign power.



wife, it is to be considered, for the weal of Scotland, that until she have children, and during her absence out of the realm, the next heirs to the Crown, being the House of the Hamiltons, should have regard hereto, and to see that neither the Crown be imposed nor wasted ; and on the other side, the nobility and commonalty ought to foresee that the *laws* and the *old customs* of the realm be not altered, neither that the country be not impoverished by taxes imprest, or new imposts, after the manner of France ; for provision wherein, both by the law of God and man, the French King and his wife may be moved to reform their misgovernance of the land.

“And for this purpose, it were good that the Nobility and Commons joined with the next heir to the Crown, to seek due reformation of such *great abuses*, as tend to the *ruin* of their *country*, which must be done before the French grow too strong and insolent.

“First, That it may be provided by consent of the three estates of the land, that the land may be free from all idolatry, like as England is, for justification whereof, if any free general council may be had where the Pope of Rome have not the seat of judgment, they may offer to shew their cause to be most agreeable to Christ’s religion.

“Next, To provide that Scotland might be governed in all rules and offices, by the ancient blood of the realm, without either captains, lieutenants, or soldiers, as all other Princes govern their countries, and especially that the forts might be in the hands of mere Scottish men.

“Thirdly, That they might never be occasioned to enter into wars against England, except England should give the first cause to Scotland.

“Fourthly, That no nobleman of Scotland should receive pension of France, except it were whilst he did serve in France ; for otherwise thereby the French would shortly corrupt many, and betray their own country.

“Fifthly, That no office, abbey, living, or commodity, be given to any but mere Scottish men, by the assent of the three estates of the realm.

“Sixth, That there be a council in Scotland appointed in the Queen’s absence, to govern the whole realm, and in those cases not to be directed by the French.

“Seventhly, That it be by the said three estates appointed, how the Queen’s revenue of the realm shall be expended, how much the Queen shall have for her portion and estate during her absence, how much shall be limited to the governance and defence of the realm, how much yearly appointed to be kept in treasure.

“In these and such like points,\* if the French King and the Queen be found unwilling, and will withstand these provisions for the weale of the land, then hath the three estates of the realm authority, forthwith, to intimate to the King and Queen their humble requests; and if the same be not effectually granted, then humbly they may commit the governance thereof to the next heir of the Crown, binding the same also to observe the laws and ancient rights of the realm.

“Finally, If the Queen shall be unwilling to this, as it is likely she will, in

\* “The conclusion of the paper,” says Dr. Cook, of Laurencekirk, “is very remarkable; proceeding upon doctrines which evince the enlargement of *Cecil’s* mind, and the just sentiments of liberty which he entertained,”—and he copies the three last paragraphs. But we must continue our extracts from this learned writer, as bearing so particularly on Lord Burghley’s immediate counsel and advice: “However much the opinion thus delivered by *Cecil* corresponds with sound reason, and with the nature and design of all good government, it could not have been expected to be so forcibly urged, and so unambiguously applied, by a courtier of the age in which he lived, and by the confidential Minister of a Sovereign, who, although she exalted the glory of her kingdom, and has upon that account been long contemplated with enthusiastic admiration, was certainly in a high degree jealous of her prerogative, and most careful to prevent the representatives of her subjects from using any language, or indulging in any political speculations, which tended in the slightest manner to reduce to practice within her own dominions, what her Secretary so earnestly enforced in the case of Scotland. The Lords of the Congregation, and the preachers who supported their cause, have often been branded as seditious demagogues, merely for inculcating the political tenets which *Cecil* has interwoven in his memorial. The circumstance of these tenets being espoused by one of the ablest public characters who distinguished the reign of Elizabeth, may perhaps remove the prejudices, with which, when considered as the doctrines of Knox and his adherents, they have often been regarded: and a dispassionate examination of them can hardly fail to shew, that by maintaining them, the Scottish Reformers promoted the advancement of *liberty*, and laid or strengthened the foundation of our admirable constitution; a constitution not free indeed from defects, which every good patriot wishes to have removed,—but even with these, the wonder, the envy, and the glory of the civilized world.”—Book ii. 216, 217. We must not conceal that the same author is very severe upon the Secretary for his disregard of treaties, and for an early disposition manifested, to foment dissension among the subjects of the Scottish Queen; but there are some contradictions in his statement, such particularly, as its being the object of the English government, p. 221, to find sufficient occupation for the French troops in Scotland, to turn their attention aside from England: but *Cecil’s* plan was to procure the French troops to be withdrawn, and then to trust matters to the Scots, in full confidence that, the French once withdrawn, the two nations might be on a footing of amity. The systematic opposition to Mary of which he complains, was a systematic opposition only to those, who, through Mary, would have made havoc of England if they could, and transferred Elizabeth’s crown to the head of Mary, for the purposes of their own ambition and tyranny. Compare what he himself says, p. 240.

respect of the greedy and tyrannous affection of France, then it is apparent that Almighty God is pleased to transfer from her the rule of the kingdom for the weale of it, and this time must be used with great circumspection, to avoid the deceits and tromperies of the French.\*

“And then may the realm of Scotland consider, being once made free, what means may be devised, by God’s goodness, to accord the two realms, to endure for time to come at the pleasure of Almighty God, in whose hands the hearts of all Princes be.”

The next paper, also preserved in Sir William’s hand-writing, in the Cottonian Library, is, *a short discussion of the weighty matters of Scotland*, August, 1559.

“Question, Whether it be mete that England should help the Nobilitie and Protestants of Scotland, to expell the French : or No ?

“That No.

“I. It is against God’s law to ayd any subjects against their naturall prince, or their Ministers.

“II. It is dangerouse to doo it ; for if the ayd shall be no other than maye be

\* The doctrine here inculcated, touches upon all the points connected with a regular, though not voluntary, abdication of the throne. If it should seem to some to be partially and directly levelled against Mary, it deserves consideration, how consistent it is with the principles of our own revolution. The question did not regard Mary so much as “the weale” of her kingdom, and the probability there was of the ancient realm of Scotland, becoming no better than a transmarine colony of France ; in which case, as an hereditary monarchy, the next heir was to be looked to, for the preservation of her rights and liberties, by consent and appointment of the three estates of the realm, for even the next heir might be unqualified, as was the case at the revolution ; then the *family* to be considered, as was done with regard to Mary Princess of Orange, for James II. had a son—both father and son were set aside ; but though our ancestors are judged to have done right, and their policy stands approved, such disturbances in an hereditary monarchy, require, as Cecil states, great circumspection. See a curious discussion of a case something similar in regard to Portugal, in the John Bull newspaper, October 12th, 1828, and compare Chalmers’ Life of Mary, vol. ii. 410, &c. The last author appears to glory in *any foreign* interference with Scotland, rather than that of England ; he speaks of Scotland and France being, by the marriage of Francis and Mary, “identified, for the benefit of *both*,” and of “the *liberties* of the *people* of *both* being *enlarged*, by the effects of that union ;”—about as much, we are tempted to observe, as the liberties of the people of England were enlarged by the union of our own Mary with Philip of Spain ; with this difference, however, in favour of England, that Mary of England was not taken to Spain, and that Philip had no real authority over England. It might, Mr. C. admits, be an *inconvenience* to England, but no *injury*. We can only say, that in our estimation, it was only prevented becoming an injury, and that of the deepest stamp, by Cecil’s care and foresight.



kept in secretie, it cannot be great ; and so consequently it shall not suffice. If it shall be open, it will procure warres, and the end thereof is uncertain.

“III. It maye be dowed, that when money spent is, and aids shall be given, the French maye compound with the Scottes, and pardon that error, to joyne both in force ageynst England, which is more easy to be beleved, because they had rather make a shamefull composition with Scotland, than suffer it to be rejoyned and united to the Crown of England.

“IV. It may be dowed, that to stay the progress of religion, agaynst the See of Rome, the Emperor, the King Catholicke, the Pope, and the Potentates in Italy, the Duke of Savoye, will rather conspyre with the French King, than to suffer theis two monarchies to be joyned in one manner of religion. And in this part may be dowed that many, as well Scottes as English, that can lyke very well to have these two kingdomes perfectly knitte in amytye, will not allowe them to be knitt in a lyke religion.

“That Yea.

“I. First, It is agreeable, both in the law of God and nature, that every prynce, and publyck state, shuld defend it self ; not only from perrills presently sene, but from dangers that be probably sene to come shortly after.

“II. Secondly, nature and reason teacheth every person, politick or other, to use the same manner of defence, that the adversary useth in offence.

“Upon theis two prynciples agreed will evidently follow, that England both maye, and ought to ayde Scotland to kepe owt the Frenche.

“1. First, The Crowne of England hath a good title to the superiority of Scotland, and ought to defend the libertyes thereof, as Themperor is bound to defend the State of *Millane*, or of *Boheme*, being held of the Emyre. And to prove this superiority, remayne undowed prooffes under seal of sondry homages done to this Crowne by the Kings of Scotland successyvely. Of their accesses to the Parlements of England, of the episcopall jurisdiction of the see of York over Scotland : in consideration whereof, if it may be, it may appere that the French meane to *subdue* Scotland, and so to exempt that Realme from the amytye of England, it seemeth that England is of duety and in honour bound to preserve the Realme of Scotland from such an *absolute dominion* of the *French*.

“2. Item, Besides this interest that England hath in the Crowne of Scotland, for the quiet possession, whereas France hathe onely by their warres kept the Realme of England ;\* It is most manifest that France cannot in

\* A word seems wanting ; probably in danger.

any wise so redely, so puissantly, so easily, *offend*, yea, *invade*, and put the *Crowne* of *England* in *daunger*, as if they may recover an *absolute* authoritie over Scotland: and before that be proved, it seemeth not out of order, though not very needfull, to make manifest that the French ar to be taken as enemyes in *will*, though not in *manifest words*.

“How long time they have been enemyes to England, how *brickle*, how *false*, how *double*, their *pacts* of *Peace* have bene, the stories be witnesses, theis seven hondred yeres. Was there ever a King of England, with whom they have not made warres? And now of *late*, uppon what *occasion* they made *peace* with *England*, is too manifest.

“It was by reason of *weariness* and *povertye*, which was such, as the last French King forbore not to expresse in his letters to the Queen of England, mentioning the invasions made in Bryttaine by sea. And indeed this is to be received as a principle, that France cannot be poor above one or two yeres, nether can be so long out of wars. The revenues of the French Crown are thyngs unknown: the insolency of the French nation, being in hope of victory, is not unknown. The long old hatred of the *House* of *Guise*, which now occupieth the King's Authoritie, *agaynst England*, hath been often well understood.

“And to come nerer to the Matter; it is manifest many wayes what manner a Platt that House hath made, to *bereave* the *Queen's Majesty* of *hir crown*. In *Queen Mary's* time, the French did not let to divulge ther opinions agaynst this Lawful Title of the *Queen's Majesty*; and as it was well knowen, had not Almighty God favored the Queen's Majesty to come to the Crowne with such universal joy of her people, the French had proclaimed *ther Title* both in *France* and *Scotland*.

“And likewise in the treaty of the peace at Chasteau in Cambresis, it appeared what they would have compassed, when they pressed the Burgundians to conclude with them, and *overpass* the Treaty with *England*; alledging that they could not tell how to treat with England, but to the Prejudice of ther right; the *Dauphiness*, his Daughter, then having a right to the *Crowne* of *England*. How bold they would have been, if at that tyme she had been Queen of France, and her Husband King, as he now is? For *then* the Wisdom of the *Constable* governed the Rashness of the *Guisians*.

“Sence the Peace concluded, whilst the French King lived, what means they made at *Rome* to have made the Queen Majesty to be declared *Illegitimate*, is manifest; and so it is known that the same Sentence is brought

into France, under the Pope's Bulls. Likewise, at the confirmation of the Peace between Spain and France, at the Solemnities even where the French King was slaine, it appereth, what manifest injuriee and dishonour they did to the Queen's Majesty, to assign the arms of England and Ireland to the French Queen, and that in all their Pageants: and being admonished thereof by the Ambassador, wold nether make collorable excuse, nor *leave* it; but both continued therein, and also to despise the Queen's Majesty's Ambassador, and ratification of the Peace with the Stile. M. Meulas serv'd them with Silver vessell stamped with the usurped arms. How lightly they have esteemed the Queen's Majesty, in all this tyme appereth: For here they be bound by Treaty to deliver 4 hostages, notwithstanding that they have been pressed thereto, they have sent but three; whereof one or two be such, as if they had not been here; but whether the Queen's Majesty had not suffered the Dishonour, to have one of her subjects Murdered, and no redress thereof, but as it appered when they had committed the Murder, they disdained, and quarrelled against such as did but seke to understand the Offenders.

"Now the very cause why they stay the prosecution hereof is this, their Interruption and Parboylls unlooked for in Scotland, which doth so occupy them, as they nether can ne dare to utter ther former Maliciose purpose untill that be ended.

"But surely beside there old Cankered Malyce to this Realme, this Matter so inflameth the House of *Guise*, that they will not forbear one day longer than of mere necessity, they shall be constrained, to bord *this Realm* with the fayned *Tytle*, and to *avance the same*. It is knowen that they have sent a *great seale* into Scotland with the Armes, and very *Stile* and *Title* of *England* and *Ireland*. And what more menifest Arguments can be to shew what they mean and intend then these. In *Princes Practices* it is mere *childishness* to *tarry until the Trumpet sounds War*. All things have there causes preceding before, but nothing hath his causes preceding more *secretly* than the Practices of Princes; and of *all other* none is *so coming* as the *French*.

"It followeth to be considered, that now the French have no convenient way to invade England, but by Scotland; by Carlisle they were accustomed, by sea is not so convenient for them, the same being too chargeable for them to assayle. Wherefore if it be sene that they will pursue their purpose, and that by Scotland, then Reason must force England to confess, that to avoyde this Danger so apparent, can no way be devised, but to help that the French have not such *Rule* and *Overhand* in *Scotland* as that they may by *that Realme*, *invade England*.



“Lastly, It is to be considered how dangerous it is for England to be invaded by the way of Scotland.

“First. If the French shall present to England a Battle, either they will do it with Strangers, or French and Strangers; if they win, which God forbid, they put in hazard this Crowne. And though they Lese, yet do they not put their own Kingdom of France in Danger. And therefore it is double the danger for England, to venter Battle upon the Frontiers of England, to a Battle upon the Marches of Calais, or Bulloyness.

“A Conclusion.

“It seemeth the weightiest Matter to be considered, that either hath or can chance to England, what is presently to be done for the aid of Scotland: For if it shuld be needfull the Delay will adventure the whole: and if Loss come, it is unrecoverable.

“Wherefore it were good that the cause were well and secretly weighed: First, by discreet and wise Men, that have Experience, affected to the *English nation*, special love to the Queen’s Majesties *person*; and that done, to send by some colours for the Nobilitie, and to consult with them, or els to send some trusty persons with credit to understand their Minds.”

We have judged it right to exhibit these papers at length, though they have often been printed before, by Burnet, Strype, Robertson, &c., because they plainly shew what was the Secretary’s view of the case in all its bearings, at the very commencement of Elizabeth’s reign; and may therefore be of use to us, in judging of the policy of the measures that were afterwards adopted; we discover from the very mode in which they are drawn up, that the line of policy England had to pursue from the first moment of the Queen’s accession, was, as it were, but a choice between many difficulties,\* a tendency towards extremities one way or the other, England and her Sovereign being no otherwise to be defended, than by a positive resistance of the *French influence in Scotland*, acting upon a double motive, first, the establishment of an absolute power over Scotland, in virtue of Mary’s sovereignty, and thereby paving the way for an invasion

\* “So that this quarrel now begun is likely to be a perpetual incumbrance to this kingdom.” —*Cecil*. This soon afterwards became so apparent to the whole Council, that they readily joined in an address to the Queen, in which all the designs and deceitful practices of the French are so circumstantially set forth, that a more curious historical record scarcely perhaps exists. It may be seen in *Forbes*, vol. i. p. 390. It seems to have been drawn up by the Secretary himself.

of England, and the removal of Elizabeth; and secondly, a determination, in resentment of what was doing in England to revive the Reformation, to succour and assist the Catholics, extirpate the Protestants, and finally reduce the whole island to an acknowledgment of the Papal authority.

Nor would it be easy to shew that these two designs were ever abandoned, during the disturbances and distractions of the northern kingdom; though often pretended to be so, where advantages could be taken, of a hollow peace, or any temporary reconciliation; advantages against which England constantly had to guard, by a foresight of remote events, and a jealousy and distrust of present transactions, the grounds of which could not be clearly discerned, or could not indeed be expected to be so, but by those who like the Secretary himself, had opportunities of receiving such intelligence as might be a guide to the Queen's Council and Government.

It is well to consider this, since Elizabeth and her great minister, Cecil, stand charged in many books, with great dissimulation as to the peace of Cambray; even Sir Robert Cotton, the great collector, to whom all historians owe so much, took upon him to make a remark in his own hand on Sir William Cecil's MS. discussion to the following effect. "Notwithstanding that this month of August 1559, the treaty of Upsetlington, between the Queen of England, and Mary and Francis of Scotland, was made and confirmed; yet did she, as appears by this consultation in the hand of Sir William Cecil her secretary, continue her purpose of aid and support to the faction in Scotland of Murray."—See Sadler's State Papers, by Clifford, i. 383. But Sir Robert must have overlooked two circumstances in the discussion; first, that the peace had been made in the month of May, and only confirmed in August, and that in the mean while the French had given two proofs of their own insincerity; first, by not sending the stipulated number of hostages, and secondly, by keeping up and even augmenting their armies in Scotland. "The French," says Lord Burghley in the discussion as printed in Sadler, "have a great advantage at present, for they pretend outwardly to keep peace with us, and yet they, under the pretence of this matter in Scotland, do daily levy, prest, and send soldiers into Scotland: and England, upon colour of peace, doth not so much as *talk how to be defended*, and if it *forbear* until the French be in the *field*, then it is easily perceived how late it will be to send for succours to Almain."—"These things being but *words* of peace, of war, of levying of men, of arming, of victualling, of money, of munition, and such like, move but as *words* may, but when time shall come,

(which Almighty God prolong), then will it move and stir all good English bloods, some to fear, some to anger, some to be at their wits end."

Sir Robert Cotton made his remark no doubt in the sincerity of an honest heart, and the editor of Sadler's papers, most likely copied it under a similar impression, but Lord Burghley himself, has given us perhaps the best clue to all that was passing.\* The peace of *Cambray*, upon which the *Scotch* treaty depended, was concluded April 2d, that with Francis and Mary, May 30, the discussion was written in August.

Cecil seems to have well known that the French treaties were in general but *words*; "parchment and wax;"† and that if Elizabeth could not be protected on the side of Scotland her doom was sealed. In a letter to Sir R. Sadler and Sir James Croft, on the 3d of November, 1559, Sir William writes, "Upon the consideration of your neighbours causes there (i. e. of the Congregation in Scotland), it is here seen by such to whom it hath bene secretly committed, that the end of this *their* matter, is certainly the begynnyng of *ours*, be it weal or woo; and therefore I see it will follow *necessarily*, that we must have good regard that they fail not." It is certainly to the *necessity* of the case we must look, and the degree of probability there was, that the failure of the Congregation would inevitably let the French into England. The French had it in their power to act more openly than the English, the revolt of the Congregation

\* The following communication made to the Queen by Throckmorton, on the 27th of July, is some proof of the insincerity of the French. On the letting of the lands about Calais, it was found difficult to get any to accept the leases, as in eight years it was to be restored to England. On reference to the Cardinal of Lorraine, he made a mockery of their apprehensions; wondered how they could be "so mad," as to think any restitution was really meant. That *that* article of the treaty "was only inserted to make Englishmen believe so."—*Forbes*, i. 175.

† We must not certainly pretend to *defend* a breach of treaty, but that Cecil should be indifferent about the treaty of *Cambray* cannot be wondered. He must have known that the French, if they could have done it, would have made *no* peace with the English, but, had it been in their power, would have made a separate peace with Philip, to be the more at liberty to attack Elizabeth. Fortunately Philip did not want to make them too powerful, and, as it turned out, saw their designs upon Scotland and England, almost as plainly as Cecil; and was as much bent upon their not succeeding. "The insincere and profligate uncles of Mary," says Dr. Cook, "amidst all their negotiations at *Cambray*, never lost sight of the opportunities they might have of attacking Elizabeth, by sending fresh troops to Scotland to oppose the Protestants." The validity of treaties generally depend on circumstances; Charles V. and Francis I. concluded a treaty at Noyon in 1516, in which they *swore* to observe a *perpetual* peace, and it scarcely lasted *two* days.—*Dict. Hist. Francois I.*



affording them a plea for augmenting their forces in Scotland, which was all they wanted. *That* accomplished, to the defeat and subjection of the Protestants, no *treaty* probably would have had *force* to keep them out of England. To ward off this great danger, required certainly the utmost attention of the English Court, and must have excited a strong interest there in favour of a party, which, upon very plausible grounds, had placed itself as a sort of barrier between the French and English.—See the Queen's letter to Sir R. Sadler and Sir James Croft. State Papers, i. 566. It is certainly a most curious document, and supposed to proceed entirely from the pen of Cecil. It is impossible to suppose that such a paper will not make a different impression on different minds. Those who look for a plot on the part of England, will find it there; a deep laid plot, to enable the Reformed party in Scotland the better to obtain the aid of Elizabeth, they being at that time in a state of armed opposition to the governing powers, and a treaty in subsistence of peace and amity; still we find in this document such actual and undeniable *truths*, as ought to procure it sufficient attention and regard, as a measure of *defence* to England. The Scots had been generally insulted by the French armies; the Nobility, including the next heirs to the Crown in default of issue from Mary, had been set at defiance by a foreign Regent, the known instrument of a most powerful and bigoted French family; a claim to the Crown of England on the part of the Scottish Queen was known to have been avowed, and kept up by that family, and that nothing could so directly and immediately enable such claimants to seize upon the English Crown, as the establishment of an absolute control over Scotland, by the defeat and subjection of the Protestants. Instead of being kept in suspense and in hazard, by being obliged to continue a course of *secret* and *clandestine* communications, nothing could be fairer and better, than to have Elizabeth herself made a party, upon an appeal which might bring all these grievances and dangers together, “using therein *suche order of tyme* and *suche trewth*, as the same weare don and committed.” P. 569. If there were danger to England to the extent this letter expresses, Elizabeth was fortunate to have such servants, as Cecil, Sadler, Croft, and Randolph to defend and protect her; though while acting upon foresight\* and suspicion only, they were obliged to

\* See No. cxxix. p. 576. To ward off *foreseen danger* is always an arduous task; for if the attempt succeed and no *danger* occur, it necessarily becomes a matter of doubt whether it would have occurred, and therefore whether the means used to avert it were not superfluous or unwise, or even worse. It is impossible to proceed far in the history of this reign, particularly of those transac-

work secretly ; if *no such danger* existed, it is almost incredible that four such shrewd statesmen, could have been so misled by appearances. To *ourselves* we must confess, it has never appeared, that the danger was at all magnified beyond its reality, or that either the cause of the Scottish Protestants, or the Crown of Elizabeth could have been upheld, but by the wisdom displayed at this time by Cecil and his co-adjutors.—But to return to the celebrated Memorials of the Secretary before spoken of.

The first paper, we may observe, was drawn up, not as a direction for England, but for Scotland ; and upon a persuasion, or indeed upon an indisputable certainty, that the “ ancient weale ” of that realm, had been disregarded, invaded, and almost annihilated, by having been already too much subjected to the “ appointments of France,”—“ which being an ancient enemy to England, seeketh always to make Scotland an instrument, to exercise thereby their malice

tions in which Lord Burghley is known to have borne so large a share, without being struck with the truth of the remark we have thrown out, his whole mind seems to have been applied to the averting threatened danger from his Country, and from the person of his Sovereign ; he preserved both from the *dangers* he *foresaw*, and because those dangers were turned aside by his prudence, and sometimes by a recourse to means not free from dissimulation, and what may be called the stratagems of politics, he has been blamed and vilified ; yet it would be unfair to judge of these things otherwise than comparatively. The designs he had to avert, depended for their effect upon the same things. He made his own excuse at the outset of the contest with France in Scotland, by declaring it to be in his opinion lawful, to use the same measures in *defence* that the adversary uses in *offence*. To this maxim we must look for an explanation of many things that passed under Elizabeth, and not use terms of harsh construction without manifest occasion. We are quite aware that while *we* represent his actions to be wise, prudent, and even laudable, as necessary to the defence of his Sovereign or her kingdom ; others will conceive from the mere circumstance of their having escaped the dangers he calculated upon, that his wisdom was no better than settled deceit, and his alleged regard for the safety of his Sovereign and his country, an unfeeling disregard of the right, liberty, and happiness of others. Thus Catholic writers will constantly represent his interposition in behalf of the Scottish Protestants, to have been no better than a mischievous design, to encourage a civil war ; and all his endeavours to avoid being deceived by the French, a most insidious plan, and a most artful attempt to deceive them. This cannot be helped : we only notice it to guard our readers against an abuse of terms in speaking of the great man, whose life we are recording ; he had a Sovereign and a kingdom to defend against stratagem, false professions, and secret conspiracies ; and much secrecy, and occasional dissimulation were but too frequently his only proper means of defence. Walsingham, as well as Cecil, has been greatly abused for employing *spies*, yet in Dr. Wotton’s celebrated letter to the latter, (*Forbes*, i. 23.) speaking of his having heard of some overtures of peace being made, before he received the Secretary’s letter, he remarks, “ for every body hath espyes abroad, save we.”

upon England, and to make a foot-stool thereof to look over England as they may." Here certainly was the great grievance; as destructive of the peace and tranquillity of Scotland as of England; sufficiently so, to justify the neighbourly advice contained in the first paper, calculated to put Scotland itself on its guard against entirely surrendering its "ancient weale," into the desolating hands of foreigners, and providing as well as it could, against "the greedy and tyrannous affection of France," and "the deceits and tromperies," of that encroaching nation. There is no actual disloyalty towards Mary recommended, should she be found to have a will and power jointly with her husband, to "reform the misgovernance of the land," or in case she should live to have children, heirs of her own blood to the Crown.\* Due regard is paid to the constitutional rights and powers of the three estates of the realm, as well as to the rights and pretensions of the house of Hamilton, the next heir, so long as the Queen continued childless.

In the second paper, the manifold dangers to England, arising out of the perplexed state of affairs, are so ably pointed out, that to dispute them, would

\* Cecil has been loaded with abuse by different writers, for his conduct to Mary Queen of Scots, without sufficient attention to circumstances; he has been supposed to have had it in view to depose her from the first; by certain passages in his papers and letters, at the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, but surely it deserves to be considered how much in opposition to the true interests of Scotland she was placed by her marriage with the King Dauphin (as Francis was called before the death of his father), and how difficult it must have been at that time to consider her as the real and proper ruler of Scotland. Not many years had passed, since Cecil had probably been called, as a member of Parliament, to deliberate upon the celebrated articles of marriage of Philip and Mary; framed, as it is generally acknowledged, by Bishop Gardiner: from these we may form a conjecture, how fit it was to guard a female Sovereign from the effects of foreign influence. A brief view of some of these articles may serve to shew how far removed Mary must have been, from the proper tie of connexion between herself and her subjects. Philip was restrained from advancing any person to any public office or dignity in England, but such as were natives of the realm, and the Queen's subjects; he was to admit a set number of English into his household, whom he should use respectfully, and not suffer to be injured by foreigners; he was not to transport the Queen out of England, but at her entreaty, nor any of the issue begotten on her, who should have their education in England, and should not be suffered but upon necessity and good reasons to go out of the same, nor then neither, but with the consent of the English. That the Queen deceasing without children, Philip should not make any claim to the kingdom, but should leave it freely to him to whom of right it should belong; that he should not change any thing in the laws, either public or private, nor the immunities and customs of the realm, but should be bound by oath to confirm and keep them.—How *totally different* was Mary of Scotland's contract with Francis!



be no less than to contradict the strong testimonies to their reality, to be found in the pages of all the historians of the time, whether English or foreign ; while the extremities to which England was likely to be driven, by her case becoming an exception to the strict rules of international law, are very briefly but correctly, we think, summed up in the two following affirmative propositions, as to the expediency of England's helping the Nobility and Protestants of Scotland to expel the French.

“That it is agreable both to the law of God and nature, that every Prynce, and publyck state shuld *defend* itself ; not only from perils *presently seen*, but from dangers that be *probably seen to come shortly after*.

“And, that Nature and Reason teacheth every person, politick or other, to use the same manner of defence, that the adversary useth in offence.”

The latter may seem to require some limitations in general, but not as applicable to those times, when it may be almost said there was no law of nations generally acknowledged, but that what state, potentate, or government soever should be found *weak* enough *to be deceived*, would be sure to suffer the consequences of the most profound dissimulation. The coarse remark of Ferdinand of Spain respecting his incautious neighbour Lewis XII. is but too just a picture of the continental policy of those times. “The King of France,” said he frequently to his intimate associates, “is fool enough to affirm that I have deceived him *once*, the drunken dog lies, I have deceived him *twenty* times.”\*

There is one thing more to be noted in one of the memorials ; namely, the positive assertion of the English title “to the superiority of Scotland.” The authorities for this disputed assumption are in the paper itself severally adduced, but the importance of the claim, as urged at this *particular* moment, appears to

\* It is the more necessary to dwell upon these things, since, in consequence of the extraordinary vigilance, prudence, wisdom, and foresight, of Elizabeth's Ministers, and the part they took in succouring the persecuted Protestants in all countries, they have been particularly marked, as the disturbers and principal intriguers of Europe ; so much so, that in one rather eminent work, the Secret History of England, by a Person of Honour, 1702, the author, comparing the contest between Elizabeth and Mary of Scots to a game at cards, observes, that, though the latter had all the *Kings* on her side, and the *Pope* to pack the cards for her as occasion served, yet Elizabeth's advantages were altogether as great, since she kept all the *knaves* in her hand. The insinuation is very apparent, but we cannot any further admit the justice of the remark, than to grant, that in an age of subtlety, state-craft, and political manœuvre, Elizabeth's Ministers were never found off their guard, nor incompetent to preserve and protect the Sovereign and the country they had to defend from attacks as insidious as they were hostile.

have consisted in the *right* and *power* it gave, or might be presumed to give, to *England*, to rescue Scotland, as a fee, from the hands of France, upon the same grounds as the Emperor might interpose to protect Milan and Bohemia, as held of the Empire.\*

There is scarcely a word in this paper, that is not of the utmost importance as regards the just defence of England from the machinations of France, in virtue of its new connexion with the Crown of Scotland.

But there are other most important papers extant, that should be consulted by all who would form a just opinion of the actual state of things, at the commencement of the second year of the Queen's reign: we mean the declaration of the Confederate Lords of Scotland to the Queen of England, of their taking arms against the Queen Dowager of Scotland and the French, to be seen in Burnet, III. Part ii. No. 53, p. 360, Oxford Edition, 1816. The original being among the Cottonian MSS. Caligula B. x. fol. 24. The *Petition* of the Confederate Lords may be seen in the same place, to have leave to sue to their Sovereigns, the King and Queen (of France) "for pacification and perfect government of the realm, without alteration of the ancient liberties of Scotland." No. 55, also, being the bond of association, entituled, "Ane Contract of the Lords and Barons, to defend the liberty of the Evangell of Christ," is worth attending to; but, in the appendix to Robertson's History of Scotland, No. II. is a still more important paper to be seen, printed, as there alleged, from the Cottonian MSS. Caligula B. ix. 20th Jan. 1559-60, and said to be a letter of Maitland of Lethington's, thus directed:

"To my loving friend James, be this delivered in London."

We take our extracts of this remarkable letter from Dr. Robertson's History, more particularly, in order to have an opportunity of clearing up some mistakes that seem very extraordinary.

In the Cottonian Catalogue we find a paper of the same date, registered thus, Caligula B. ix. 47.

"A letter, perhaps from John Knox, to a friend in England, vindicating the Scots from the suspicion of treachery or ingratitude; with an historical statement of the causes of enmity between the English and Scots; also pointing out the fatal consequences of abandoning Scotland to the French;

\* With regard to this claim upon Scotland, we had occasion to make some remarks in our first volume, see pp. 206, 207.

(seemingly an original, but the signature and direction cancelled.) St. Andrews, Jan. 20, 1559."

The fact seems to be, that neither Knox nor Maitland was the author of the paper, but *Cecil* himself.\* He wished to have the Scottish Protestants assisted effectually: some of the Council were anxious to prevent it, and to turn the Queen's attention away from the real dangers with which she was threatened. Cecil wished her of course to be more rightly informed, and as the Lords of the Congregation were about to send Maitland to treat with the English Council upon the question of assistance, he was anxious of course to have the case fully and fairly represented to the Queen; he therefore prepared the document of which we have just given an account, and forwarded it to Sadler and Croft, to be offered to Maitland in their own names, as the best ground of a petition from the Congregation to Elizabeth for effectual aid. Maitland appears readily to have adopted it, and procured the Lords of the Congregation to do so also, as a *just* representation of their own case and their own feelings; in this letter, therefore, we find all the suggestions of Cecil embodied, and admirably set forth.

An excellent account is given of the ancient enmities of the two nations, which originally drove the Scots to accept the proffered friendship of France; of their subsequent discovery and experiment of the ambitious views, and the treacherous conduct of their foreign allies, and of the hearty desire now felt, viz. Jan. 20, 1559, to renounce that alliance, and be taken under the protection of England; a statement sufficient, we should think, to satisfy any reasonable mind, that the views of the Confederate Lords, &c. were truly patriotic, as far as regarded the liberties and ancient laws of their country, and that England had just cause not to allow a party so friendly to herself, and a confederation so important, as a check to the measures of the French, in such a particular crisis, to be discomfited, or brought under subjection to a foreign power, acting in the name of their lawful Sovereign indeed, but to all appearance against her true interests, and the best and most manifest interests of no inconsiderable portion of her subjects.

The avowed object of this important letter, was to remove the distrust, that some persons in England had evinced, of the fidelity of the Confederates, in case they should receive from England the succour they implored. If the

\* See the letter from Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir James Croft to Mr. Secretary Cecil, *Sadler's State Papers*, vol. i. 602, No. cliii.



nature of the cause, and present state of our country, says the writer, be considered, "I doubt not but judgment, sal be able to banish mistrust;" and speaking of the original disposition of the French to be friends with the Scots against England, he observes, "The French zour auncient enemyes, considering well how nature had sa placed us in a island with zow, that nation was able sa to annoye England as *we* being eneyemies, sought to joine us to theym in ligue, tending by that meane to detourrre zour armyes from the invasion of France, &c.—this was the beginning of our confederacy with France.—The maist part, of all querells betwixt ws since that tyme, at least quhen the provocation came on our syde, hes ever fallen out by *theyr* procurement rather than any one caus off ourselves: and quhensaever we brack the peace, it come partly by theyr intysements, partly to eschew the conquest intended by that realm. But now hes God's providence sa altered the case, zea changed it to the plat contrary, that now hes the Frensche, taken zour place, and we, off very judgment, becum desyrous to have zow in theyr rowme. Our Eyes are opened, we espy how uncareful they have been of our weile at all tymes, how they made us ever to serve thyr turne, drew us in maist dangerous weys for theyr commodite, and nevertheless wad not styck, oft tymes, against natour of the ligue, to contrak peace, leaving ws in weyr. We see that theyr support, off late zeres, was not grantit for any affection they bare to ws, for pytie they had of our estate, for recompense off the lyke friendship schawin to them in tyme off thyr afflictions, but for ambition, and insaciable cupidite to reygne, and to mak Scotland ane *accessory* to the crown of *France*.—We feared *ze* meant the conquest off Scotland, and *they* are planely fallen to that work.—Quhais aid could we implore, being destitute of zour friendship, gif they off new wald attempt theyr formar enterprise?—I wald *ze* should not esteme ws sa barayne of judgment, that we cannot forese our owne perril; or sa foolishe that we will not study by all gode means to entertayne that thing may be our safetie, quhilik consistes all in the relaying of zour friendship.—I pray zow consider in lyke case, when in the days of zour princes off maist noble memory, King Henry the VIII. and King Edward the VI. meanes were opened of amitye betwixt baith realms; was not at all tymes the difference of religion the onely stay they wer not embraced? Did not the craft of our clergy and power of theyr adherents subvert the devises of the better sort? But now has God off his mercy removed that block furth off the way: now is not theyr practise lyke to tak place any mare, when we ar comme to a conformity off doctrine, and profes

the same religion with zow, quhilk I take to be the straytest knot of amitye can be devised;—*I pray zow, let not zour men dryve tyme in consultation quhether ze sall support ws or no. Seyng the mater speaketh for itself, that ze mon take upon zow the defence of our caus, giff ze have any respect for zowr awne weill.* Their preparatives in France, and levying of men in Germany, (quheyroff I am lately advertised) ar not altogydder ordeyned for us, *ze ar the mark they shote at; they seke our Realme, but for ane entry to zours.* Giff they should directly schaw hostile to zow, they knaw zo wald mek redy for theyme; therefor they do, by indirect meanes, to blind zow, the thing, they dare not as zit planely attempte. They seme to invade us to th' end, that having assembled theyr hale forces sa nere zour bordours, they may unlock it to attack zow: It is ane off theyr ald fetches, making a schew to one place, to lyght on ane other.—It is grosse ignorance to misknaw, what all nations planely speke off. Tak hede ze say not hereafter, 'had I wist;' ane uncomely sentence, to procede off a wyse man's mouth.

“Let not this occasion, sa happely offered, escape Zow? Giff ze do, neglecting the present opportunitie, and hoping to have ever gode luk comme sleaping upon zow, it is to be feared zour enemye ware to great, and sa strang, that afterwards quhen ze wald, ze sall not be able to put him down; and then, to zour smart, after the tyme ze will acknowledge zour error, ze have felt, by experience, quhat harme cometh off oversight, and trusting to zour enemy's promisses; We offer zow the occasion, quheyrybby zour former losses may be repayred; Quhilk gif ze let over slyde, suffering ws to be owerrun, quha then, I pray zow, sall stay the Frensche, that they sall not invade zow, in zour own boundes, sick is theyr lust to regne, that they can neyther be content with theyr fortune present, nor rest and be satisfied when they have gode luk, but will still follow on, having in theyr awne brayne conceived the image of sa great a conquest, quhat think ye sall be the end? Is ther any of sa small jugement, that he doth not foresee already, that theyr hail force sall then be bent against zow?—It was not theyr great rediness for weyr made theym to tak this mater on hand, at this tyme, but rather a vayne trust in theyr awne policy, thinking to have found na resistance, theyr opinion has deceaved theym, and that makes them now amased.—Gif the like occasion wer offered to the Frenche against zow, wey, how gladly would they embrace it. Are ze not eschamed of zour sleuth, to spare theym that hes already compassed zour destruction, giff they wer able? consider with yourself quhilk is to be choysed? to weyr against theym without zour realme or within? Giff quhill ye sleape we sal

be over throwne, then sall they not fayle to sute zou in zour awne countrey, and use ws as a fote stole to overloke zow ; But some will say, perhaps they meane it not. It is foly to think they waid not giff they war able, quhen before hand they stick not to giff zour armes, and usurpe the style of zour crown.—Let zou not be moved for that they terme ws rebelles, and diffames our just querrell with the name of conspiracy against our soverayne. It is hir hyenes right we manetayne. It is the liberty of hir realme we study to preserve, with the hazard of our lyves. We ar not (God knoweth) comme to this point for wantones, as men impatient of rewl, or willing to schake off the yoke of government, but ar drawne to it by necessite, to avoyde the tyrannie of strangeeres seaking to defraude ws of lawful government.—We mean no wise to subtrak our obedience from our soveraine to defraude hir hyenes of her dew reverence, rents, and revenues of hir crown. We seke nothing, but that Scotland may remaine, as of before, a fre realme, rewlit by hir hyenes, and hir ministeres borne men of the sam; and that the succession of the crown may remane, with the lawful blode.—I wold wiss that ze and they that ar learned, sould rede the twa former orations of Demosthenes, called Olynthyacæ and consider quhat counsal that wyse Oratour gave to the Athenians his countrymen, in lyke case ; quhilk hes so great affinite with this cause of ours, that every word thereoff myght be applyed to our purpos. There may ze learne of him quhat advise is to be followed, when zour nyghtbours hous is on fyre.”

We have been the more careful to point out the exact grounds upon which England, at this time, interfered with the affairs of Scotland, and stood forward to support a party opposed to the Government of that country, because, without a perfect understanding of those *grounds*, the means resorted to may be misjudged, and any interposition at all, on the part of England, deprecated as improper, presumptuous, and not defensible on any principle of the law of nations. We have endeavoured to shew, by referring to the papers above, that the course taken by England, was regarded as entirely and necessarily defensive, as well by Scots (and certainly no contemptible party of Scots), as by the English Government itself.\* We have, by no means, done justice to the papers themselves, as most

\* We might add by the French Ambassador in London. See the letter from M. de Noailles to M. de Oysel, in Scotland, 22 December 1559. Forbes, i. 284. Though the letter we have been citing, is supposed to have originated with Sir William Cecil himself, yet its ready adoption by Maitland, and the Heads of the Congregation, is sufficient to give it the stamp of a truly Scottish document.



important political and historical documents, by our garbled extracts, but as they may be read at length in the books referred to, or in the originals still extant; we have forborne to crowd our pages with more than seemed entirely necessary to the purposes of the history before us: but from this time, and from the first steps taken to prevent the French establishing, to the great danger of England, an absolute power in Scotland, scarcely any thing seems to have passed but with the knowledge, or under the special superintendance and direction of the subject of this Memoir. To him all letters seem to have been in the first instance addressed, or through others communicated; every military movement, every financial regulation, every appointment of ministers or messengers, every consideration of the exact posture of affairs, as regarded either country, seem to have been with one consent submitted to him. "Secretary Cecil," says Camden, "was for his singular wisdom employed by Queen Elizabeth, as her chiefest minister, in these and all other matters." To use a very common, but significant expression, he seems to have been the life and soul of all proceedings; no very enviable situation, but one, from which, as it would appear, he could never afterwards, with any safety to his country or his Sovereign, much less to his own ease, effectually withdraw.

The first thing to be done with a view to the Scottish affairs, in this second year of her Majesty's reign, seems to have been the sending down such persons to the north, as might be expected best to watch the opportunities of assisting the confederated Protestants, and to prepare such forces by land and sea, as might prevent any fresh reinforcements arriving from France, or any great advantages to be gained over the Protestants by the French forces already in Scotland, and under the direction and command of the Queen Dowager.

The following entries among Lord Burghley's notes, may shew what was done.\*

\* In the first year of the Queen's reign, the marches, as well as Berwick, appear to have been entrusted to bad hands; the Earl of Northumberland particularly, and Lord Dacres, both Catholics, and of course unfriendly to the Scottish Congregation, and the designs of the English Council, to render them assistance; of these things Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir James Croft had great occasion to complain. Lord Dacres, in particular, in order to alienate the Scots in general from England, encouraged, or at least permitted, the English borderers of his march to enter Scotland, and provoke hostilities; and their attacks being particularly directed against the estates of Lord Maxwell, a zealous reformer, who by that means was kept from joining the Lords of the Congregation; the intent and purpose of such proceedings, became but too apparent; the Graymes, or Græmes, appear to have been the chief transgressors.—See *Sadler's State Papers*, i. 452. 463. 469. 476.

“November 17. ao. 2do. Eliz. Consultation for order of the realm, viz. D. of Norfolk to be lieutenant in the north, Lord Grey, lord warden of the east marches.

“December 16. William Winter sent with a navy of ships to the north seas, and so he went to the Firth.

“—25. The D. of Norfolk lieutenant-general in the north; the Lord Grey then was warden of the east and middle marshes. Sir Ralph Sadler adjoined to the D. of Norfolk.

“The same day the D. of Norfolk sent as lieutenant of the north to Newcastle.”

In Haynes's collection of the Burghley papers now in the Museum, we have many important letters, particularly from the Duke of Norfolk, to Mr. Secretary Cecil, upon the first arrival of this commission in the north parts; but before we proceed to relate the course of their proceedings, it may be proper to take account of the exact posture of affairs in Scotland, as between the Lords of the Congregation (for so the heads of the Protestant party began now to be called), and the Regent.

We have already shewn how disingenuous the conduct of the Regent had been towards the Protestants, so soon as she felt herself able to do without them; that is, so soon as ever she was *reconciled* to the Hamiltons and *Popish clergy*, with the Archbishop of St. Andrews at their head; and thereby prepared on all hands, by furthering the Pope's cause, to promote the views of her brothers of the house of Lorrain, equally bent upon obtaining the rule in Scotland, and extirpating heresy. Cause enough was given to the Protestants, on the score of religion only, to prepare for their own defence; but it was by no means unreasonable for them to stand forth as the champions of their native country, the defenders of her ancient honours, rights, and privileges, against a foreign court prepared to bring them all under her own yoke,\* and to trample

\* Dr. Robertson is very eloquent upon this double object of their exertions.—“She” [the Regent], says he, “found, however, that the preservation of the Protestant religion, their zeal for which had at first roused the leaders of the Congregation to take arms, was not the only object they had now in view; they were animated with the warmest love of civil liberty, which they conceived to be in imminent danger from the attempts of the French forces; and these two passions mingling, added reciprocally to each other's strength. Together with more enlarged notions in religion, the Reformation filled the human mind with more liberal and generous sentiments concerning civil government; the genius of Popery is extremely favourable to the

upon all who should seem in any manner to resent or resist its spreading usurpations. As to the extirpation of heresy, the Regent, urged on by her foreign relations, made no secret. To the expostulations of the deserted Protestants, she gave no other answer, than that she saw reason to break all her princely promises to them, and that henceforth heresy, only another name for protestantism, was to find no indulgence.

It is needless to go far into the prevarications and treachery of this altered Princess, when, submitting her own better judgment to the will of her brothers, she assumed the character of a professed persecutor of Protestants, and promoter of foreign interests.\* The accounts of broken treaties, and violated faith, may be found in other books; we shall, as an introduction to what is to follow regarding the interference of England, copy from Haynes's Burghley papers, a very short remonstrance of the Protestants, to some proceedings on the part of the Regent, clearly indicative of hostile designs on the part of France (and unconstitutional as such), with the Regent's answer. At this time, it should be observed, many of the first nobility of Scotland, were decidedly on the side of the Protestants.† The cause of remonstrance, was the occupation of the important town of Leith, by French soldiers and their families, to the absolute dispossession of the native and ancient inhabitants, who were driven from their houses, and left to wander where they could. The date of the Remonstrance is October 19, 1559, rather more than a month before the termination of the first year of Queen Elizabeth's reign.

"Yt wyll please your Grace come to your Remembrans, howe at our laste convention in *Hamilton*, we required your Hieghnis in most humble maner, to desyste from the fortifienge of this towne of *Leyth*, then interprysed and begon, which appered to us, and yet dothe, a manyfeste entrie to a conquete,

power of Princes." We cannot continue the extract; but much more that is extremely forcible and good, to the same purpose, may be read in the original.—*History of Scotland*, vol. i. anno 1559.

\* Dr. Cook's History of the Reformation may be consulted for a very dispassionate account of the unfair, rather treacherous, dealings, of the Regent and her party, after she had made peace with the clergy.

† They had indeed been lately joined by the heads of the House of Hamilton, the Duke of Chatelherault, and soon afterwards his son the Earl of Arran; the latter of whom having rendered himself so obnoxious in France, to the Princes of Lorraine, on account of his attachment to the reformed religion, as to be in danger of his life, had made his escape from that country, and passing through England been encouraged to oppose to the utmost of his power in Scotland, the encroachments of France.



and overthrow to our liberties, and altogether agaynste the lawes and custumes of this realme; seeing it was begone and yet contynuethe withoute anye advice or consent of the Nobilite and Councell thereof. Wherefore accordinge to our Deutie we owe to our Common Weele, now, as oft before, we most humbly require your Grace to cawse your *Strangers*\* and Souldiars whatsomever, withowte delaye depart oute of the sayde town of *Leyth*; the strengthe of the which not only dystroyethe that, but feareth as well the inhabytants as other *Schottishe* men, our Souvereyn Ladies lyege subjects, of whatsomever estate thei be, may resorte thereunto in maner accustomed to have their lawful

\* Chalmers, in his *Life of Mary Queen of Scots*, is quite indignant at the thoughts of the French *soldiers* being spoken of as *strangers* or *foreigners*, because on the marriage of Mary and Francis, it had been settled that the natives of Scotland should be naturalized in France, and those of France in Scotland; by this act, says he, "Scotland and France were *identified*, for the *benefit* of both." He could not possibly have said more in vindication of the policy of *Cecil*, and of the Protestants of Scotland: this identification of the two countries was the work of the *Guises*, and "through *them*" (the greatest tyrants and bigots in Europe) "the *liberties* of the people of both countries," if we may give credit to Mr. Chalmers, "were to be *enlarged*." It is distressing to meet with such absurdities in a work, which, from the literary fame of the author, has been read and admired, we are sorry to say, by a large number of unwary readers—ourselves among the rest, before we had an opportunity of examining narrowly into the merits of the case—such is the amount and value of desultory reading.—As he is careful to condemn, in most opprobrious terms, the public measures of England, in regard to Scotland, not only under *Elizabeth*, but under *Henry* and *Edward*, that is, "during Mary's *infancy*, for the subduction of Scotland," as he calls it, "by that alien and corrupt power;" we trust we shall now be excused for entering so far back in our first volume, into the real history of the two countries, in a *Life of Lord Burghley*.—We are willing to allow for national prejudices, but are persuaded (as indeed we have endeavoured to shew through the whole of that volume), that the Scotch are wrong in imputing to England evil designs against *their* country or countrymen, as distinct from the French. Had it not been for the latter, the two crowns and the two kingdoms, would probably have been united, and the people of both countries brought into a state of peace and harmony, a full century before either of those events actually took place; but the Scots seem so resolved to throw the blame of every thing that came to pass on the *English*, rather than on the French, that the first thing Goodall (in his *Vindication of Mary*) finds to allege against *Murray*, is, that in the time of Edward VI., to whom at a very early age he had become known, "he had declared himself, to be *against the French*, an expression unknown among Scotsmen in former times, but which had then lately come in use among some persons, and chiefly among the men of Fife, who were forming designs for *selling* or *enslaving* their native country to the English." It is curious after this, to find that *Murray* should have been the very person, in Elizabeth's reign, who stood forward to prevent his native country being *sold* to, or *enslaved* by, the French.

traffique.\* Assuringe your Heighnesse that yf ye in refusynge the same, declare your evle minde towards the common weale of this realme, or nation, and libertie of the same, we wyll wythowte delay, mean, as of before, the cawse unto the whole Nobilite and Communalitie thereof. Requiring most humbly your Grace' answer in haste with this beerer, because the Fact proceeds dailie to the *conqueste*, as apperethe to all men.† And so after our humble commendations, of our service unto your Hieghenes, we cōmmende your Grace to the eternall protection of God.—

“At Edenboure, 19th Oct. 1559. Your Graces humble and obedient Serviteurs.”

The Regent's reply was as follows: dictated no doubt by a furious bigot, placed at her right hand by the *Guises*, Pelleve or Pelleuce, Bishop of Amiens, servilely devoted to his employers, and who had been specially sent by them to Scotland, to stir up the Queen Dowager to the most outrageous measures.—

“After Commendations, we have received your Lettre of Edenboure the 19th of this instant, which apperethe to us rather to have come from a Prince to his subjectes, than from subjects to them that berythe autorite—for answer whereof we have presently sent unto you this Berrer, *Leon Heraulde* Kyng of Armes, sufficiently instructed, with our mynde, to whom ye shall gyve Credunce. MARIA R.

“At Leythe, 21st of Oct. 1559.”‡

The Herald so sent appears to have charged them, upon their obedience, to depart every man to his own house.

\* In a letter from Balnaves to Sir Ralph Sadler, he writes, “This enterprise of Leith hath inflamed the harts of our people to a woonderful hatred and despite of Fraunce, wherethrough I think there shall follow a playne defection from Fraunce, for ever.” This letter is dated 23d September, 1559.—*Sadler's State Papers*, i. 462.

† Chalmers, who objects so greatly to the French soldiers being called *strangers*, because on the marriage of Mary and Francis, the subjects of France were naturalized; forgets that by the terms of the same marriage, the *liberties* and *laws* of Scotland were to be preserved. See his first vol. p. 115.

‡ Sadler and Croft, in a letter to the Secretary, September 27, 1559, report, that the Duke of Chatelherault sent word to the Regent (before he joined the Protestants), that, it was much misliked that the French did fortify at Leith, requiring her to stay it, or else she must be sure that the nobility of Scotland would not suffer nor indure it. “Whereunto she answered, that it was as mete and lawfull for her daughter to fortife where pleased her in her own realme, as it was for him to build at Hamilton; and she would not stay it, unless she were by force impeched.”—*State Papers*, i. 467.

We need not surely make many comments upon this abrupt answer to the patriotic remonstrance of the Protestants.\* *Conquest* seemed evidently to be in contemplation: the *conquest* of their country; and as a very manifest consequence, if it took place, their own destruction, or ruin. The Nobles of Scotland, as Robertson justly observes, had not been accustomed to such treatment, even from their own monarchs; whom, according to the spirit of their peculiar aristocracy, they had often restrained and controlled; and they could be little expected therefore to bear such indignities at the hands of a foreigner. A Convention was speedily called, with as much attention as could be expected, under such circumstances, to the ancient forms of proceeding; and in this assembly, consisting of Peers, B<sup>a</sup>r<sup>o</sup>ns, and Representatives of Boroughs, animated by the presence, and no doubt highly stimulated by the zealous and uncompromising advice and exhortations of Knox, who appeared as the representative of the reformed clergy;† it was determined, without one dissenting suffrage, that the Queen should no longer be allowed to act as Regent, so much to the detriment of the kingdom; having intimated to them that she did not hold herself bound to *keep faith with them*, they considered their *allegiance* at an end. They formally therefore suspended her from the office, in the name of the King and Queen, to whom they professed all duty and submission; but in whose absence, and to preserve the Constitution inviolate, they undertook to act as the natural guardians and protectors of the kingdom. “The born counsellors of the realm,” as Lord Ruthven is reported to have called them, in the following question proposed to the assembly, in which he happened to preside: “Whether she who had so contemptuously refused the humble request of the born counsellors of the realm; she also being only a Regent, whose pretences threatened to subvert the liberty of the commonwealth, should be permitted so tyrannically to domineer over them?”—*Cook’s Reformation*, ii. 192. ; see also the act of suspension, p. 198. and the able remarks of the author upon it, 202. Their resistance to the authority of the Regent, however, had little effect on the latter; the French garrison at Leith defied their feeble endeavours to remove them, and entirely refused to depart the kingdom. The measure was certainly a violent one, and the French had managed to make it

\* Chalmers speaks with disdain of the efforts of the reformed party to maintain their liberties, “*against all law* ;” but it was against French domination.

† Knox’s speech, as reported by Dr. McCrie, and Dr. Cook, after Wodrow, was far from improper or disloyal; indeed remarkably guarded.



as unwarrantable as they could, by naturalizing the subjects of the two kingdoms reciprocally; so that the French in Scotland, would not submit to be called or regarded as foreigners. In such an emergency the application of the confederated Nobles, to England, was natural and (as far as possible) necessary. We have copied the letter of Maitland of Lethington, as containing a very just description of the actual posture of affairs, and as proceeding from a man highly competent to understand the purposes of the French, both against Scotland and England. In fact, he held a high station in the former country, being the Queen's Secretary; and if, in communicating so freely with England, he should be thought to have betrayed the confidence of his royal mistress, we may surely be allowed to say there are some interests paramount to those of the mere possessor of the throne.\* Interests, which, if the possessor of the throne be induced to abandon, or oppose, by ill advice at home, but much more through foreign interference, it belongs to others to maintain and support, to the utmost of their means. Castelnau, the French minister, who was far from approving the conduct of the Princes of Lorraine towards Scotland, acknowledges, with his usual candour, as Dr. Robertson says, that the Scots declared war against the Queen Regent, rather from a desire of vindicating their civil liberties, than from any motive of religion. When the Earl of Glencairn and Sir Hugh Campbell, in a conference with the Queen Dowager, in behalf of the Protestants, heard her declare, that the promises of Princes should not be urged upon them, when they could not conveniently fulfil them, they are stated to have made this memorable reply—"If you have resolved to keep no faith with your subjects, we will renounce our allegiance, and leave you to reflect upon the calamities which will thus be entailed on the country."—*Cook*, i. 69. Maitland, according to Robertson, had remonstrated against the violent measures of the Regent and her family, till he thought his life in danger.

The application of the Scottish Protestants to Elizabeth seems to be a case of this description; Mary's foreign connexions were, under the pretended sanction of her name and authority, rudely trampling upon the rights and liberties of Scotland.† They were manifestly looking towards England, as the end

\* Of England's interference, Chalmers speaks as follows:—"Elizabeth thus, by means of a faction, endeavoured to overrule the authority of the estates of the realm. This was sufficiently abominable in her; but it was still more base in the odious man who acted as her instrument."

† In the minute (*Sadler's State Papers*, i. 416, No. xxii.) addressed to the Lords of the Congregation, 1559, the encroachment of the French is made the great point to be considered;

of their conquests, and triumph over Protestantism, and what mercy could the Scottish Reformists expect, standing in the way of such a revolution? It was quite as natural for England to listen to their application and espouse their cause, as it was for them to open such a communication; and in order to be upon a perfect understanding with the reformed party in Scotland, we find, from Lord Burghley's notes, that in January, 1559-60, "Lyddyngton," the writer of the letter to which we have referred above, "was at Westminster to be conferred withall for Scottish matters;" nor, according to the same notes, does he appear to have "returned to Scotland," before the 18th day of February. On the 27th of which month a regular Convention seems to have been formed, between the Queen's northern Commissioners and the heads of the CONGREGATION. Lord Burghley's note of which is to the following effect.

"Feb. 27, The accord made by the Duke of Norfolk at Barwick, with the L. James, L. Rutten, L. Petarro, and Mr. Maxwell." This accord held out a promise to the Protestants of *open* assistance.\*

speaking of the aid to be solicited of the Nobility in general, "whereunto," it is said, "their natural love to their country ought to induce them, rather than suffer the violent conquest of the French, which undoubtedly do mean to subvert and extinct the native blood of Scotland, inheritable to the same, if the French Quene, your Soverain, should die without issue, and to annex that realm perpetually to the Crown of France, which we think all true Scottish men should naturally detest and abhorre, and whylst time serveth, prevent and foresee the same."

\* The most material articles of this celebrated Convention, were as follow: 1. Elizabeth took into her protection the kingdom of Scotland, the Duke of Chatelherault and his party; in order to maintain Scotland in its liberties, as long as the marriage of Mary with the King of France subsisted, and a year longer. 2. She engaged to send them succours, and to continue the same till the French were driven out of the kingdom. 3. She bound herself to make no agreement with France till the French and Scotch were agreed to let the kingdom of Scotland enjoy its full liberty. 4. She engaged not to abandon the Confederates, as long as they owned Mary for their Queen, and endeavoured to maintain the rights of the Crown. 5. That if the English took places in Scotland from France, these places should be demolished or delivered to the Duke of Chatelherault, at his choice; and that the English should make no fortifications. 6. The Duke and his party pledged themselves to join their forces to those of England. It was farther stipulated: 7. That they should not suffer any union of Scotland and France, but what then existed. 8. That the enemies of England should be the enemies of the Scotch. 9. That if England were attacked by France, the Lords should furnish the Queen with 2000 foot and 2000 horse. 10. That if the invasion should be in the North, they should join their forces to those of the Queen at their own expense. 11. That the Lords should give hostages to remain in the hands of the Queen of England, as long as the Queen of Scots' marriage with the King of France subsisted. Lastly. The confederates protested that they would continue loyal to the Queen of Scotland, and

Though the English court appeared willing to accede to the application of the Scottish Protestants, it was extremely difficult to know how, or to what extent, it might best render them the succour and support solicited.\* It was manifestly imprudent to provoke a war with France. It was equally imprudent to shew too great forwardness to enter Scotland, with an armed force, after the jealousies that had been excited in former reigns, by the claim, not yet abandoned, of a feudal superiority. It was prudent to leave the Scots to expel the French by their own exertions if possible, and to render such aid only, as might least excite the suspicions of the French party. Both money and strength were wanting; the former might be supplied;† the latter not so easily, except by preventing any accession of strength to the adverse party; for which purpose it was that Admiral Winter was sent, as Lord Burghley's notes assert, with "a navy of ships to the North seas, and even into the Frith of Forth," where reinforcements from France were known to be daily expected. The presence of the English fleet was intended to deter the French from entering; but not to *begin* a conflict, without extreme necessity. This policy however did not suit the parties it was intended to assist. If the fleet did nothing, it was soon found that its presence would only depress the ardour of the Protestants, who were hard pressed by the Government, and prevent the

to the King her husband, in every thing that did not tend to the subversion of the laws. See Cook's Reformation in Scotland, after Knox, with Knox's judicious preamble, vol. ii. pp. 254, 5.

\* The delicacy of the case is well stated by Sir R. Sadler in his report to the Secretary, of his conference with Balnaves, Sept. 1559. "Marry we told him they were wise men, and coulede consider, as well as we, what might be done by her. Highnesse in that behalf, considering that albeit the cause was grounded uppon a good and godly foundacion, to extirpe idolatry, and advance Criste's trew religion; and also for the preservation of the fredom of their Country, and to deliver the same from foreyn governement, as in conscience they are bound to do; yet the worlde can make nae other exposicyon of it, but that they be as it were a faction gathered together, contending agenst thauthoritye: and who the Quene's Majestie may seame to maynteyne them in such a case, we doubted not but he, being a wise man, could wey the same as depely as we did."

† See letter from Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir Jas. Croft, to Mr. Secretary Cecil, *Sadler's State Papers*, i. 399. and No. xii. p. 402. from Secretary Cecil to Sir Ralph Sadler. "The French make many shews of great good will towards us: wherin, notwithstanding, we be tought not to be deceived."—"The French were embarked (for Scotland) the xxth of this month (August 1559), being in number 14 sayles, but as yet I have no knoedg certan of their passing by, there is 1000 pykes and 1000 harquebusiers. One Octavian an old Millenor (Milanese) of this court hath chief charge."—This Octavian shortly afterwards arrived at Leith with a regiment of French soldiers; but this was a part only of the reinforcement intended. The rest were dispersed in a storm.



*neutrals*, of which there were many watching for what might come to pass, from joining them. The Secretary was decidedly for supporting the Congregation, and anxious in every way to be rightly informed of their precise wants, expectations, and intentions; but the Queen very early proved herself to be her own Prime Minister, and capable of throwing impediments in the way of the best concerted counsels. The pecuniary succours required alarmed her prudence, and rendered such supplies more scanty and uncertain than the emergency of the case seemed to demand. Nor was her Majesty clear from the adverse practices of those of the Privy Council, who had been the servants of her sister and Philip; and who were far from wishing well to the *Protestant* cause. Lord John Grey complains of the interference of these counsellors, whom he calls *Philippians*, from their attachment to the King of Spain, in a curious letter to the Secretary, dated from Pyrgo (the family seat), and beginning thus—"Cousin Cecill, I heartily thanke you for your letters and friendshipp dayle sent and shewed, the continuanns whereof with all my heart I require, and to be playne with you so muche the rather, for that I well understand ye are the only mayntayner of Gode's cause, and the Defender of your Countrie."—April 20, 1560. See also McCrie's Life of Knox, where, noticing the backwardness of Elizabeth to assist the Congregation effectually, partly from her extreme caution and parsimony, and partly from the influence of *some* of her Counsellors, at the very time when the French envoys were seeking to persuade her to desert the cause; he adds, "at last she listened to the advice of her *ablest Counsellors*, and resolved to prosecute the war with vigour. No sooner did she evince this determination, than the French Court yielded to all her demands."—Vol. i. 319. It is curious to compare with this the account given by Throckmorton, in a letter to the Queen, of a conversation he had had with the Cardinal Lorrain, relative to a seizure made of some of his English dispatches, which were supposed to have passed into the Cardinal's hands. In this conversation his Eminence, it seems, complained greatly of the *young* Counsellors whom Elizabeth was disposed to trust more than those who were "elder in Government and of more experience;" *he* no doubt would have rather had her listen to the *Philippians*. "His countenance and gestures in this talk," says Throckmorton, "were so demure and grave, mixed with a kind of pitiful plaint, that they would have persuaded a man, that had not well known him within and without, and known what a Frenchman is in a little adversity."—*Forbes*, i. 423, 424. The Queen was backward to render assistance also, probably, from her knowledge of the ill state of her kingdom to maintain a war,

if she committed herself too far, and because she judged that information was sought through a channel obnoxious to her feelings. Knox had fallen into such disgrace with her, by his book against the regimen of women,\* that he could not obtain leave to visit England. He penned indeed an apology to her Majesty; but so awkwardly or injudiciously, as to induce his biographer, Dr. McCrie, to think it never reached her Majesty's hands; owing to the care and better judgment of *Cecil*, to whom it was intrusted: not that the Secretary wished to impede the reconciliation, if it could have been accomplished, but that he judged the letter might defeat its own purposes, and be ill received, as had been the case with Luther's apologetical letter to her father; otherwise Knox's information was considered to be of such importance, that upon an expectation of meeting and conferring with him, Cecil came as far as Stamford, unknown to the Queen, for the express purpose; but it was not in the power of the Reformer at that time to get so far.† It would seem indeed that they had met once before

\* It may be added, by his republican tenets, and Genevan discipline, "of all others," (writes the Secretary to Sir R. Sadler and Sir Jas. Croft, Oct. 31st, 1559,) "Knoxces name, if it be not Goodman's, is most odious here, and therefore I wish no mention of hym hither."

† See McCrie's *Life of Knox*, i. 288. 290. where the author endeavours to excuse his becoming occasionally a politician, "it being difficult to preserve Christian integrity and simplicity amidst the crooked wiles of political intrigue." Of his communications with Elizabeth's Commissioners, see Sadler's *State Papers*, 1559, 60. Knox communicated with the English Ministers, under the assumed name of John Sinclair; he seems to have expected more from them than could reasonably be asked, and to have conducted himself with less caution than the state of things required.—*Sadler's State Papers*, i. 523. His courage, however, at all events, deserves praise; "I have need," he writes to Railton, "of a good and an assured horse, for great watch is laid for my apprehension, and large money promised till any that shall kyll me."—The Secretary however distrusted his prudence. "Surely I like not Knoxces audacity," says Cecil, in the postscript of a letter, in Nov. 1559, to Sir R. Sadler; "his writings do no good here, and therefore I do rather suppress them, and yet I meane not but that ye should contynue in sending them." He might indeed very reasonably wish not to have Knox's opinions wholly kept from him; for at times none could judge more properly of the extreme importance of the crisis to which things had been brought. The Protestant Lords indeed, while Knox was abroad, had particularly consulted him upon that nice point of resistance to supreme rulers; and he had submitted it, it seems, to the judgment of the most learned on the Continent. Soon after they had agreed to the marriage of their young Queen to the Dauphin of France, the Scots began to be jealous of the designs of the French court against their liberties and independence. Their jealousies increased, after the Regency was transferred to the Queen Dowager, who was wholly devoted to the interest of France, and had contrived, under different prettexts, to keep a body of French troops in the kingdom: "The Reformer," says his learned biographer,

and conferred together, for Knox arrived in Scotland from Geneva, on the 2d of May, 1559, and is said to have seen Cecil on his passage, and to have become fully acquainted with his views.—(Sadler's State Papers, i. 445.) Of Knox's real opinions we have a good account, in the able work of his biographer, Dr. McCrie; to whose pages we must refer, for many excellent and judicious remarks on the course of events at this time, particularly in Scotland.

We have mentioned that besides the Duke of Chatelherault, the Congregation in the course of the year 1559, obtained the countenance and assistance of his son, the Earl of Arran; and as Lord Burghley has been much blamed by certain writers, for the part he took in the return of this young Lord to his native country, we shall endeavour to set the matter in as clear a light as we can.—That he arrived at a very critical moment is most certain; that he was obliged to be smuggled as it were into Scotland, is also most certain, passing thither through England under the feigned name of Beaumont, and running many risks of discovery, before he reached Hamilton, his father's palace. It would seem strange, that a person of such high connexions, should have been so little at liberty to enter his native country, and that Lord Burghley in particular, for assisting him to return, should, with many writers have incurred such obloquy as is known to be the case. It has been considered, indeed, as entirely a scheme

Dr. McCrie, “displayed his moderation, and the soundness of his principles, in the advice which he gave at this critical period—he did not attempt to inflame the irascible minds of the Nobility, by aggravating the mal-administration of the Queen Regent. On the contrary, he informed them of a rumour circulated on the Continent, that a rebellion was intended in Scotland; and he solemnly charged those who professed the Protestant religion, to avoid all accession to it—he did not mean, he said, to retract the principle which he had advanced in former letters, as to the lawfulness of inferior magistrates, and the body of a nation resisting the tyrannical measures of supreme rulers; but recourse ought not to be had to resistance, except when matters were tyrannically driven to an extreme.—His advice and solemn charge to them was, that they should continue to yield dutiful and cheerful obedience to all the lawful commands of the Regent, and endeavour by humble and repeated requests, to procure her favour, and to prevail upon her, if not to promote their cause, at least to protect it from persecution.—If, while they endeavoured peaceably to accomplish this, attempts should be made to crush them by tyrannical violence, he did not think that they, considering the station which they occupied, were bound to suffer their innocent brethren to be murdered. On the contrary, it was lawful for them, nay it was their bounden duty to stand up in their defence; still protesting their readiness to obey the Regent in all things consistent with their fidelity to God.”—*McCrie*, i. 213—216. This was written in Mary's reign, 1557; but we must acknowledge that he was far from being always so temperate. Collier however presses too hard upon him.



of Cecil's, to set the Crown of Scotland on his head to the dispossession of Mary, and to unite the kingdoms, by obtaining for him the hand of Elizabeth: that such projects never entered the head of this eminent Statesman we cannot certainly pretend to say; but if it were so, they admit of an explanation not injurious to his principles. The French had managed to place Mary in a situation so obnoxious to the wills and wishes of a large proportion of her subjects, and were supposed besides to have extorted from her such a reversionary claim to the Crown of Scotland, in case of her death without children, that it became proper for the interest both of England and Scotland, to consider the rights of the next heirs, and to take care, that they should not be invaded by foreign usurpations. The Hamiltons were decidedly the next in the line of inheritance, the Duke himself had abandoned the Regent, had been slighted by her, and was not without reason placed at the head of the Protestant party, on account of his near relationship to the Crown; but he was too weak to be trusted as the leader of any party,\* and probably it was on this account (presuming, that is, upon the very unfitness of the Duke for such a charge), that the Queen Dowager had extorted from him a promise, as some write, that his son should take no part in what was going on; no very obscure intimation of her ill intentions towards the house of Hamilton in regard to the succession. Arran it is true was in the service of the French King, being Colonel of the Scottish Guards there, where we are told he was regarded, "as an honourable hostage for the honesty of his father."† A strange situation to hold, if his father's rights as well as his own were in danger from the French in his native country; especially after Arran himself, as is generally admitted, had even in France, imbibed the new doctrines.‡ The King, it seems, having summoned him to attend his

\* "The feeble and vacillating disposition of the Duke of Chatelherault, of which he shewed so many instances when Governor; had rendered him contemptible, in spite of his high rank and relation to the Crown."—*McCrie*. On the 20th of August, 1559, Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir James Croft had written to Cecil, to advise him of the importance of having the Earl of Arran in Scotland, who should have more estimation than his father.—*Sadler's Papers*.

† Lingard.

‡ Chalmers says he was become a furious Huguenot, and of course a useful helpmate to John Knox, for which end, that is, as he sneeringly intimates, by printing it in *italics*, "for the benefit of religion," he was brought from France and sent to Scotland, under the fortunate auspices of Mr. Secretary Cecil.—Vol. i. p. 8. We are not disposed to deny any part of this statement, we must admit that he was even smuggled into Scotland under a feigned name by Cecil, who lent him money out of his own purse (200 crowns), and which were very punctually repaid, but that Cecil

duty at the intended marriage of the French Princesses, his daughter and sister, with the King of Spain and Duke of Savoy, he made excuses, and suddenly withdrew, at the suggestion, *as has been said*, and with the aid of Throckmorton, the English Ambassador. For some time his steps could not be traced, but he was at length found at Geneva, "whence he wrote a letter, it is also said, expressive of his gratitude to the Queen of England," with which she was highly displeased.\* The learned author, whose account we are chiefly following, is disposed to attribute the whole scheme to Cecil and Throckmorton, and to believe, upon the authority of *Persons*, Cecil's great calumniator, that the Queen's displeasure arose, from the Secretary's having secretly encouraged Arran, in case of success, to expect her hand, whereby the two kingdoms might become one, which was alleged to be his constant aim.

We need not, as we conceive, deny so much as one of these facts, though we feel ourselves by no means bound to adopt the same conclusions with regard to them. That Arran abruptly quitted his command seems true; but instead of seeking a passage either to England or Scotland, it seems equally true that he made his way to *Geneva*, probably because he had "imbibed the new doctrines;" another admitted fact. Geneva was the focus, not only of Swiss but of French protestantism; Religion therefore so far seems to have been his ruling motive. Robertson says, it was intended to charge Arran with heresy; but of this fact the learned author seems to entertain some doubt, he says Robertson took it from *De Thou*; an author who appears to have known pretty well, what was really passing amongst the *Guises*. But Throckmorton it seems, in his letters to *Cecil*, never mentions the cause of his desertion, nor contradicts the rumours of his own concern in his flight. If the cause of his desertion were well known to his correspondent, there was no need to dwell upon it, or even mention it, and as to his own concern with Arran, Throckmorton's notice of the *rumours* without contradiction, rather proves to us, that he regarded them only as *false* rumours. *Buchanan's* account is not mentioned by the learned author

was bound by any moral or political obligation not to do this, under the *altered* circumstances of the case, we cannot bring ourselves to acknowledge. The father of Arran had joined the Protestant Lords, and his son stood proscribed by France for having imbibed the new opinions, and being obliged to fly for his life, was he not to be assisted to return to his native country, and father's house, when the very care that had been taken by the French and the Regent, to keep him out of Scotland, betrayed their purposes, and artful designs against that country.

\* Lingard.

in his notes upon this passage of the Earl of Arran's life, we shall therefore transcribe it. "The cause of the Earl of Arran's return was this; he was more eager and zealous in the cause of Reformation than was safe for him in those times, and therefore he was designed to be put to death by the *Guises*, who were the favourites of Francis the younger (the Dauphin), for the terror of the inferior orders of men: nay the Cardinal of *Lorrain* was so bold in a speech, which he made in the Parliament of Paris, inveighing against the cause of Reformation, that he said, they should shortly see some eminent man suffer upon that account, who was little inferior to a Prince; he (Arran) being made acquainted therewith, and withal calling to mind, that he had a little before been free in his discourse with the Duke of Guise upon that head, by the advice of his friends provided for his safety by a secret flight; and contrary to all men's expectations came home in the midst of his country's tumults."

We imagine then the case to be this; that this young man had incautiously exposed himself to the resentment of the *Guises* by too freely discovering his attachment to the reformed doctrines; thereby affording them but too fair a ground secretly to meditate his ruin, as being so near an heir to the Scottish throne, while in France they could pursue him as a heretic. That the Cardinal of Lorrain inadvertently by his speech in Parliament let him into the secret of his danger; upon which he fled to the nearest seat of Protestantism, Geneva; that there Throckmorton found him out,\* and possibly upon the suggestions of *Cecil*,

\* Dr. Lingard by way of keeping up the impression of Throckmorton's being the instigator, under Cecil, of all that took place, says he was either *accompanied* or followed to Geneva by Throckmorton's agents. We question the accompaniment. From a letter preserved in Sadler's State Papers, from Cecil to the Duke of Chatelherault, August 1559, in which he acknowledges having received the Duke's thanks for the good will he had shewn to his son (Arran), we should be led to conclude with the editor of the letter, as expressed in a note, i. 404, that, "the aforesaid Earl of Arran, being driven to take refuge in England, it would seem that his *father* had *bespoke for him* the protection of Cecil."—This is consistent with a passage also in a paper to which Dr. Lingard refers, namely, the special memorial to Sadler; in which the following suggestion is offered to the Duke of Chatelherault. "Item, The Duke may pretend as good cause to arrest Monsieur D'Oysell and som other of the French, for aunswering for his two sonnes the Erle and Lord David, as the French have don in *driving away the one*, and imprisoning the other, being neither of them his subjects, nor offenders against him." The title of this memorial is said to be in the hand-writing of Mr. Cecil. There is certainly a good deal of the subtle policy of the sixteenth century in it, but the objects in view are constantly the same. The danger to the repose both of Scotland and England, from the interference of the French. The extreme importance of lodging "the governance of Scotland" in all its branches, in the hands of natives. The



represented to him the disturbed state of Scotland, the contempt with which his family pretensions to the Crown appeared to be treated by the Regent; the importance of his presence in Scotland if it could be managed; and perhaps the prospect might be held out to him, of eventually marrying Elizabeth, in case Mary's death without issue should open to him a way to the throne; or her continual absence procure him to be constituted Regent.—There is nothing unnatural in this, though whoever knows any thing of Elizabeth's history, would understand her coquetish *resentment* of any hopes held out to Arran, of a matrimonial connexion with her, had it been really so. But in her letter cited from Forbes, she is made to say as follows; “It seemeth very strange that the Earl of Arran maketh mention in his letters, that he has cause to thank us for the offers made to hym by us; we be in doubt what to thynk; and do much myslike that any such occasion should be gyven by any manner of message sent to him.” In fact, she did not like to appear herself in the business, and the Earl probably through want of discretion, by addressing his letters immediately to her, induced her to cast the odium of the negotiation from herself upon her minister. *Persons* makes out that the letter implied an offer of her hand to Arran, and Lingard inclines to follow him. Surely whatever might have been *suggested* by Cecil, of such future prospects, as arising out of the aspect of affairs in Scotland, he was much too wise to make direct *offers* of the *Queen's hand* to Arran, as proceeding from *herself*; he must have been not merely unwise, but the weakest of men to have done so. Perhaps Arran may have stumbled upon the word *offers*, in his letters of thanks for the notice taken of him, and assistance proffered him, and raised in the Queen's mind a *reasonable* resentment of so imprudent an expression; but Cecil, from his own confession, had enough to do to manage the Scots, in negotiations of any hazard or secresy; “of all others,” he writes to Sadler, “these Scottes be the openest men that be,” that is, the most incautious, even where

risk incurred by the next heirs to the Crown, of having their rights intercepted or crushed, and the possibility of the young Queen's dying without issue. The spelling of this memorial differs considerably from what appears in most of Cecil's own papers, yet he was undoubtedly well acquainted with its contents, and nothing certainly could be less reduced to fixed rules, than orthography, at this time; an instance is given in Zouch's *Life of Sir Philip Sydney*, of the same word in one particular MS. being spelled in no fewer than five and twenty different ways.

Dr. Cook, whose account of the whole proceeding seems very correct, says, that at Geneva Arran found Randolph, and with him returned to England. Randolph might very likely be sent there to meet him; he was the very man likely to be so employed; but it was very reasonable so to employ him, considering the artifices and designs of the French.

their own interest was concerned. Randolph gives the same account of them, "I maye be bolde to lett your honors knowe that they are too open in all their dooyngs."—*Sadler*, ii. 516. This does them no greater discredit, than that of being very bad politicians for the age in which they lived. "To be plain with you," says Sadler or Croft, in one of their letters to Knox, "ye are so open in your doings, as you make men half affrayed to deale with you, which is more than wisdom and polycie doth require." Knox was incautious in writing as well as acting, according to the remark in one of the Secretary's letters to Sadler and Croft, already quoted. "Suerly I lyke not Knoxces audacite, which also was well taymed in your answer; his writings doo no good here, and therefore I doo rather suppress them, and yet I mean not but that you should contynue in sending them."

Many instances indeed occur of their betraying themselves, by a common want of prudence in regard to the enemy, who was viligant enough to take every advantage, of that nature; and more expert at *practising deception*, of which we have some intimation in the very letter in which Cecil complains as above of the carelessness of the Scots. "At this present," he writes to Sadler from the Court, November 25, 1559, "Monsieur Ruby\* is here, and hathe spoken with the Quene's Majesty this daye, his errand I thynk be to go to France, and by the way here to expostulate upon certain greefes in that Quene's name. He telleth many *tales* and wold very fayne have the Quene's Majestye believe that he sayth *truth*—well the Quene's Majestie hath answered them as was *mete*; that their tales have many parts, and require *proves*, which *if they bryng*, hir Majestie will give order to punishe this falte in any subject that she hath."

We may see from this, and many other circumstances, how much deception was attempted to be practised *against* England. The question as it regards Elizabeth's ministers is, could she or her kingdom have been defended effectually without some dissimulation on their part? Nothing can be said in excuse of such conduct, considered abstractedly; but the whole system of European politics in the sixteenth century, seems generally admitted to have been a system of stratagem against stratagem; the least suspicious, and the most blindly confident, were sure to suffer.†

\* On the part of the Queen Dowager of Scotland.

† It would be difficult to conceive a more perplexing case than the one in agitation at this time. France notoriously preparing an augmentation of forces in Scotland, to reduce the

It will have been seen that it was early in January, according to Lord Burghley's notes, that "Lyddyngton was at Westminster to be conferred withall for Scottish matters." On the 18th of February, he returned to Scotland;\* and on the 27th of that month, as we have before shewn, her Majesty's Commissioners at Berwick agreed to act hostilely against the French, if necessary, in aid of the Congregation.

In the mean while measures were taking at the Court, to procure the revocation of both armies; the English army under Norfolk, as well as the French army from Scotland. On March the 2d, three days only after the accord made between the English and Scotch Commissioners, we find the following entry among Lord Burghley's notes.

"March 2. A Treaty with Du Cevre for the manner of the revocation of

Protestants to submission; but as long as they were not dismissed, or if dismissed, as long as they could ostensibly pretend, that they were only sent to subdue *rebels*, there was no breach of treaty with England on the French side; while England could not but feel that the Scots insurgents were all on her side, in regard both to religion and the keeping the French out of Scotland, whence England might be invaded, though it was better to prevent it by upholding the Scots Protestants, and enabling *them* to expel the French, than by provoking a decided war by a premature breach of treaty on her part.—See Cecil's Letter, *Sadler*, ii. 567, &c. a curious document.

\* On occasion of his return, the Secretary [*Cecil*] wrote thus to Sir Ralph Sadler at Berwick: "Good Mr. Sadler, you have known this berer the Lord of Ledyngton, but I here have had great prooffe of hym, to be both wise, honest, and constant. I pray you, lett hym receive your frendly entertainment, with some addition for my sake. God send us a good end of your ministerial labours. He can shew you howe lowe the Frenchmen flye, yet can stowpe now to any Englishman's whystell. Tyme serveth all tornes, and loss of tyme loseth all good things. From Westminster, the 18th of February, 1559. Yours, as ye knowe assuredly, W. Cecill."

In another letter, March 22, we find the following passage: "Well, how so ever the matter is, good courage in a good quarrel, as this is, to *delyver a realme from conqueste*, and consequently to save *our own*, will much further the matter." These should be considered as the real objects of the Secretary's policy, and as far as regarded the *conquest of Scotland*, the object of the Congregation, as in their address to the Lords of Scotland, March 27, 1560, [*Sadler's Letters*, No. ccxxxii.] they express themselves, speaking of the "manifest conquest which the French intended to make of their native realms, conquyert and defended by the blood of their progenitors," and calling upon them as "kynd and true Scottismen to join in stopping them of their pretence," and to "assist in expelling the saide strangers," at the hazard of being otherwise reputed plain enemies to the common weal of their native country and "assistors to the said Frenchmen in conquesting thereof." The fortifying of Leith by the Regent, was the first prooffe alleged by the Reformers of the design to make a conquest of Scotland.—*Cook*, ii. 187.



the English army and the French also out of Scotland, but Du Cevre delayeth." On the 9th, as appears from Haynes, 258, (a minute of Secretary Cecil) the Queen wrote to the Duke of Norfolk, to apprise him that she had received a message from the French King, offering to reform all that was amiss, to make an accord with England, and leave Scotland free from danger of conquest. That in consequence of this, the Queen had given them to the 28th, to withdraw their troops, and "come to a reasonable accord," but if this should prove to be only an effort to gain time, the entry was to be made on the 28th. On the 12th of the same month we find the following entry: "March 12. Bishop of Valence come into England." On the 24th again we have another entry: "A Proclamation by her Majesty to declare hir mind to keep peace both with France and Scotland, notwithstanding the occasions given by the French King and his wife, the Queen of Scotts, in claiming the Title to the Crowne."

These three entries throw a light upon the subject, little noticed by historians. They tend to shew that whatever secret negotiations and communications were going on with the Congregationists, the army was not allowed to act, without a public statement being made, of the grievances England was anxious to have redressed, by Du Sevre and Monluc Bishop of Valence; who appear to have been in London on the 24th; and in whom the French had two ministers and negotiators upon the spot, to be exceeded by none, according to all accounts, in *subtlety* and *state craft*; and indeed Elizabeth appears at first to have been no match for them.

On the 28th, however, according to Lord Burghley, "the army entered by land, with the Lord Grey, into Scotland;" hurried thither, no doubt, by a movement of the Regent, to surprise the castle of Glasgow, and disperse the troops under the command of the Duke of Chatelherault; they succeeded in reducing the Episcopal palace, but were called away by the entrance of the English army into Scotland.

On the 4th of April the Lords of the Congregation forwarded to the Queen Regent an address from Dalkeith, which deserves to be transcribed.\* It was

\* The Lords of Scotland at this time confederate against the French, were as follow, according to *Holinshed*; "the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earl of Arran his son, the Lord James Prior of St. Andrews, the Earl of Argyle, the Earl of Glencairn, the Earl of Rothouse, the Earl of Sutherland, the Earl of Monteith, the Earl of Huntley, the Earl of Caithness, the Earl of Errol, the Earl Marshall, the Earl of Morton, the Earl of Cassilis, the Earl of Eglinton, the Earl of Montrose, the Lord Ruthen, the Lord Boyd, the Lord Ogletree, the Lord Erskin, the Lord

sent to her in the castle of Edinburgh, to which she had retired for safety, and it is the more to be attended to, since it seems to have been dismissed from the midst of the *English* army, which the Reformers had joined on the 1st of April; we copy it from Buchanan.

“ We have oftentimes heretofore earnestly intreated you, both by letters and messengers, to send away the French soldiers, who do yet another year grievously oppress the poor country people; nay, they excite a just fear in the commonalty, that they shall be reduced into a miserable servitude; from which fear we have many times intreated you to deliver us; but when our just intreaties prevailed nothing with you, we were enforced to represent our deplorable estate to the Queen of England, as the nearest Princess to us, and to desire aid of her to drive foreigners who threatened to make us slaves, out of our kingdom; and that by force of arms, if it could not otherwise be done. And though she, out of a sense of our calamities, hath undertaken our cause, yet, that we might perform our duty to the mother of our Queen, and might prevent the effusion of Christian blood as much as is possible, and might then have recourse to force of arms, when we have tried all other ways to obtain right without success, we do as yet esteem it a part of that good temper which we ought to keep, again to pray you to command the French soldiers, with their commander and officers, to depart immediately out of the land. In order to the accomplishment whereof, the Queen of England will not only afford them a safe passage through her kingdom, but will also assist with her fleet to transport them. If this condition be rejected, we call God and Man to witness, that we take up arms, not out of hatred, or any wicked intent, but enforced thereto by mere necessity, that so we may try the extremity of remedies, that the commonwealth, ourselves, our estates and posterity, might not be precipitated into utter ruin. And yet, notwithstanding, though we at present suffer very heavy pressures, and more heavy ones are near approaching, no danger whatsoever shall ever enforce us to depart from our duty towards our Queen, or from the King her Husband, in the least tittle, wherein the destruction of our ancient liberty, and the ruin of ourselves and our posterity, is not concerned. As for you, most excellent Princess, we beseech you again, that weighing the equity of our demands, the inconveniences attending war, and how necessary peace is to this

Drummond, the Lord Hume, the Lord Rose, the Lord Creighton, the Lord Levingston, the Lord Somerville, the Master of Lindsey, and the Master of Maxwell.” The list of those who concurred in the act of suspension may be seen in Cook’s History of the Reformation, vol. ii. 201.

your Daughter's Kingdom, so miserably harassed, you would afford a favourable ear to our just request : which if you shall do, you will leave a grateful and pleasing remembrance of your moderation among all nations, and will also consult the tranquillity of the greatest part of Christendom. Dated at Dalkeith, the 4th of April, in the year 1560."

We shall be told that the loyalty exhibited and professed in this address, could not be sincere, because there were two aspirants to the throne among the Lords of the Congregation, Arran and the Prior of St. Andrews. The Regent, indeed, had been careful to excite these suspicions with regard to *both* ; but if both were aspirants, they must have been rather in opposition to each other, than so closely confederated, as at this time appears to have been the case ; for on the retreat of the Reformists from Edinburgh, after their failure before Leith, Lord Arran and the Prior stayed behind *together*, and were anxious not to abandon the cause in the way the others seemed to do. In Sadler's State Papers there are besides several letters signed by these two lords in particular, under every appearance of cordiality, and what is more, of a deference on the part of Lord James to Arran's higher legitimate rank—thus, *James Hamilton*, *James Stewart* ; or, as it often is, *Therle of Arrayn*, and the *Lord James*. Throckmorton and *Cecil* are indeed continually accused of intending to place Arran on the throne ; but it should be considered, before we blame (rather before we execrate, as some authors pretend to do) such projects and designs, in what state the Sovereign really was. In the hands of the French, she was Queen by courtesy, rather than in reality. If the French designs should not be completely frustrated, and the Queen still remain alienated, as it were, from her native country and kingdom, it might become a question whether such absence, at the risk of her subjects being made to surrender the ancient rights and liberties of Scottish men, might not amount to abdication ; and in such case, the house of Hamilton undoubtedly had the best claim to the crown. We certainly cannot praise or commend the terms in which Throckmorton decides upon such a revolution in some of his letters to *Cecil*, but we can forgive the feeling with which they contemplated such an issue of things, as the best security that could be offered to England. We can, in short, forgive the strong assurance they must have entertained, that nothing could be more entirely adverse to the peace of both kingdoms, than Mary's close connexion with England's perpetual enemies, and more particularly with that very family whose determination to resist the progress of the Reformation, and extirpate heretics, was known all the world over.



"The best worldly felicity," says Cecil, in his famous Memorial, "that Scotland can have, is either to continue in a perpetual peace with the kingdom of England, or to be made one monarchy with England, &c.—When Scotland shall come into the hands of a mere Scottish man in blood, then may there be hope of such accord ; but as long as it is at the *commandment of the French*, there is no hope to have accord long betwixt these two realms."\*

Mary, or rather her relatives, we may be assured, would have dispossessed Elizabeth, and made *one monarchy* of the island at once, had not Cecil by his wisdom and foresight interposed ; but the latter could not be said, to be grasping at so much for Elizabeth, while he allowed, that if the kingdom of Scotland were "in the hands of a mere Scottish man of blood," the accord he wished for might be sufficiently secured. We may ask, had Mary of England been conveyed to Spain, when she was married to Philip II., and entirely surrendered the government of her native country to Philip and his emissaries, and by the gift of the Crown Matrimonial and other secret acts, made over the reversion of her throne to *strangers*, should we as Englishmen have thought it unreasonable to look to the next heir, or heirs, for protection and security against foreign influence, and what was worse, foreign dominion ? Cecil had had these chances before his eyes ; he had already had one heir presumptive under his protection, and no wonder that he should look a little to the interests of another, when the salvation of his own country might be at stake.† Had Mary lived abroad for

\* In a letter from Sir Ralph Sadler to Cecil, March 31, 1560, asking for more money for the Congregation, he says, "What is xx m<sup>l</sup>. (20,000*l*.) more or less in a Pryncis purse, specially to be employed where such an advantage may be taken as is now likely to be had in this case, whereby in my poure opynyon, it must neds folowe, either that these ij [two] realmes shall be conjoynd in perpetuall unytie, or at the leste, to brede such an enemytie between the French and the Scotts, as the French shall never have oportunitie greatly to annoy us by the way of Scotland, which hath ever been the only way whereby they could do us much annoyance ; but I nede not tell this to you, who knoweth better than I what is most like to folowe of this matter." He presses the supply the more earnestly for fear the Lords of Scotland, "being now our friends, becom our enemies, and joine with the French against us, as they have don in tymes past."—*State Papers*, i. 716.

† In Sadler's State Papers, i. 404, in a letter to the Duke of Chatelherault, the Secretary writes, "But I will not molest your Grace ; this one thing I covet, to have this isle well united in concord, and then could I be content to leave my lief and the joye thereof to posterite."—But there is another passage we must bring forward, more applicable to what occurs in the text, and of which we were not aware when we first threw out the remark ; it is contained in a special memorial for Sir Ralph Sadler himself. "Item, To procure that the Duke (of Chatel-

many years, without children, as Queen of France, what good prospect was there during the two first years of Elizabeth's reign, for the house of Hamilton, the liberties of Scotland, or the independence of England? \* It must have been upon these contingencies that Cecil acted; considering the British interests at stake, to speak by anticipation of both countries jointly. Arran had better have been made King of Scotland, and even Elizabeth united to him by marriage, than that the Queen of Scotland should have remained in France entirely under the control of her bigoted family. It is idle to talk of an inveterate enmity against a young woman of Mary's age; we must look for the cause of her calamities constantly to the bigotry of her relations, and their incessant enmity to Elizabeth and England. We are quite willing to confess

herault) may for preservation of the expectant interest which he hath to ye croune, yf God call the yong Quene before she have issue, 'instantly withstand the governance of that realme, by any other than by the blud of Skotland, like as the King of Spayne being husband to the Quene of Ingland, committed no charge of any manner of office spirituall or temporall, to any stranger, neither dothe he otherwise, nor his father before him in his countries of Flanders, Brabant, or any other, but suffereth them to be governed holy by their owne nation. In this point yf the Duke meane to preserve his title, ought he to be earnest, for otherwise he may be assured, that the French, under pretense of subduing of religion, will also subdue the realme, and extirpe his house."

\* In Holinshed the motives for Elizabeth's interference are well enough set forth.—"The Queenes Majestie, with advice of her Graces counsell, considering of this weightie businesse, and withall foreseeing the malicious purpose of her adversaries, and howe the Queene of Scots was in France, married and governed, so as she was not able to use the libertie of her Crowne, did thinke it best to prevent such mischiefs as might insue, if timely remedie were not used, to displace such dangerous neighbours the Frenchmen, that began to nestle themselves thus stronglie so near at hand, for no good purpose as easilie might be guessed."

In Cecil's celebrated letter to Lord Huntly, March 18, 1559-60, in Haynes, written to induce him to join the party of the Congregation, his story is constantly the same. "Procede now, my Lord, I say, to the savety of your country, preserve your owne ancient house. remember there is no thyrd thing to choose, but either to suffer the insolency of France, or to be preserved with a naturall governance; surely whosoever shall speke of a third, that is of a favourable governance by Frenchmen, yea though they be never so few, he either is ignorant or meaneth depe deceyte. No governance shall so accord with Scotland, but a lawfull governance of naturall people, for my part, I assure you, my Lord, that whatsoever it shall please God to offer to the concord of these two realmes, being at the creation knitt in one isle, and with one language, and one sort of people, having no difference but name, I will employe my endeavor to the performance therin, of God's favour and good will." This is so similar to the papers of the Duke of Somerset, at the beginning of Edward's reign, noticed in our first volume, as to leave but little room to doubt that Cecil (as we there intimated) had a chief hand in the earliest negotiations of this description.

that we never saw these things exactly in the light we now do, till we were led to examine into the policy of Lord Burghley, with more exactness than perhaps has ever before been applied to the subject; but we feel bound to state the result of such researches. It is our full belief, that nothing could have saved either Scotland or England, from the grasp of the Catholic continental powers, in the sixteenth century, but the wisdom of Cecil, the fortitude of Elizabeth, and their joint discreet choice, of other most able ministers and negotiators.

But we must return to the military operations that were going on in Scotland. The Lords received no favourable answer to their last address. Lord Grey, Warden of the East and Middle Marches, had entered with the English army, under the directions of the Duke of Norfolk, as Lieutenant-general of the Queen's forces in the North, and for the purpose of watching every opportunity of rendering assistance to the party *opposed to the French*, without exciting the jealousy of the *Scots*.<sup>\*</sup> The latter were to be left still to fight their own battles, as long as any prospect should appear of their being able to settle matters, or expel the French *by their own strength*; and most extreme caution appears to have been used, to prevent the Scots harbouring any other thoughts of Elizabeth's interference, than that she was anxious to preserve Scotland in obedience to its

<sup>\*</sup> It was extremely difficult in this case, as upon former occasions, to assist the Scots, without hazard of their taking a wrong view of the designs of England. In no instance had England any enmity towards *Scotland*, if it could but be separated from its fatal connexion with *France*. Sir Ralph Sadler, writing of the difficulties of providing in Scotland for the forage of the horses of the English army, says, "So we doubt how it shall be possible to provide for the feeding of so many horses in Scotland at this time of year, which is to be well considered; for when this power shall enter into Scotland, they must think themselves to be in their *friends* country, where no spoil is to be made, but must take that they can get for their money, whereby to entertain the love of the people in such sort, as they may perceive us to come for *their good*, and not for their evil."—*State Papers*, i. 652. But of the good intentions of England towards Scotland at this time, we cannot well doubt, after the testimony of so able a man as the younger Maitland of Lethington, the agent of the Congregation at the English Court; on the 11th of January, 1559-60, he writes thus to Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir James Croft, from London: "I have, by divers zour lettres, communicated unto me by Mr. Secretary (Cecil), weill onderstand zour earnest good will and greate labours to the furtherance off the cause I have in hand, quharby my sute has not been a little advansit. If I should thank zow, it wer too bare a recompense, seing the uttermost I am abill to do is not sufficient to contervale the least part of zour frendships. Ze have enterit my hail nation in obligation unto zou; and I hope it shall prove at length ze have also weill deservit off zour awin countrey. Ze will onderstand more by Mr. Secretary's writing, nor I myself am zit privy to, although I be in gude hope—Zours at commandement,  
"W. MAITLAND."



Queen, and the freedom of the country (it might have been said of both kingdoms) from the designs of the French.

It appears indeed from the correspondence of the Duke of Norfolk with the Secretary at this time, that the greatest care was taken not to commit Elizabeth, by any over-eagerness to take part in the expulsion of the French, for fear, by giving umbrage to the Scots, she might even make enemies of friends, and in the end minister to the very purposes of the French.\* The case was certainly an extremely delicate one, and seems to have been managed with consummate policy, prudence, and deliberation.

The fleet, under Admiral Winter, was undoubtedly sent thither with a view to prevent the entrance into Scotland of any fresh reinforcements of French troops;† but professedly, according to the Queen's declarations and instructions, rather to preserve peace than to break the same:‡ of the truth and sincerity of which there can be little doubt, England being so unprepared for war, and the Queen exceedingly loath to part with her money. Dr. Lingard, an author whom we must excuse for seeing many things in a different light from ourselves, in any contest between Protestants and Catholics, seems to regard the proceedings of Elizabeth and her Council as one continued scene of duplicity; speaking of the remonstrances of Noailles, the French Ambassador, against the warlike preparations on foot [Dec. 20.], "Elizabeth," he says, "assured him of her determination to maintain the peace of Cateau: and as a proof of her sincerity, wished that the curse of Heaven might light on the head of that Prince, who

\* "The caution of Queen Elizabeth and her Ministers, and their experience of the fluctuating councils of the Scottish Nobles, led them to demand hostages before the march of their auxiliary army into Scotland."—*Clifford, Sadler*, i. 662, note.

† "The French preparations be so great, as we see not how they may be withstand when they be at the full, except they be impeched in the beginning, the first meane therein is to obteyne the Fryth into our possession for the stay of any greater succour."—Cecil to Sir R. Sadler, Dec. 16, 1559. On the 19th Sir Ralph writes to Cecil, "If ye mind there (at court) to folow these matters here agenst the French with such effect as now it semeth to me ye intend, wherein I wold to God ye had been more forward in time; for God's sake put to your helping hand." Can any thing more fully express the danger to be apprehended from the French preparations and proceedings, than what is said, in a letter of Cecil to Sadler and Croft, Dec. 23, 1559, "The whole coasts of France prepare to war; and therefore it is full time that we see to our parts. God give you both good nights, for I am almost asleep. At Westminster, hora 12<sup>a</sup> nocte, 23 Dec. W. CECIL."

‡ "The French are yet presently in Sterling, so that there is neither suretie nor leisure of preparations so long as your shippes are not arrived, which would *put rest to all*."—Letter from the Earl of Arran and Lord James to Sir R. Sadler and Sir James Croft, January 4, 1559-60.

should be the first to violate it." We do not think there was any insincerity in this, according to what the same learned author reports even of the answer of the Council: "The Council," he writes, "replied that Francis and Mary, by assuming the style and arms of England, *had furnished* ample ground for *apprehension*; and that *while* the *French Monarch continued* to recruit his forces both at home and in *Scotland*, they should be wanting in their duty, if they did not advise the Queen to prepare for the defence of her own dominions. *Noailles*, however, was not *deceived*; he denounced the hostile intention of the English cabinet to his Sovereign, and to the Queen Regent of Scotland."\* Duplicity there certainly was; but not any general insincerity as to the views of the English Court and Council. Francis and Mary had, since the conclusion of the peace, repeated the offence of using the English arms and title. Letters had been intercepted, which threw much light on the designs of the French, in a correspondence carried on through the French Ambassador himself; the treaty had begun to be infringed by the French; and there can be little doubt but that the preparations in the French ports, whence a fleet was hourly expected to

\* Noailles remonstrated, it seems, on the 20th of December. Now we happen to know, that on the 9th of that very month Sadler and Croft had given intimation to the Secretary, that the French troops were taking possession of Aymouth, with intent on to fortify it: the fortifications of which very place they had stipulated to raze in three months after the conclusion of the peace. The Queen therefore in her reply to their dispatch, dated December 13, had good reason to say, that this was "so directly both against the treaty, and the surete of our town of Berwicke, that although we have hitherto borne with divers misorders of the French, yet can we not forbear to impcche this violation of the peace." But Cecil's own letter is more particular, of the same date as the Queen's, "This tyme tarrieth not as ye see; this daye your advertisement of the matter of Aymouth maketh us styrr. The truth is, we here ment before, that my Lord of Norfolk should be at Newcastle before the end of this month. Our shippes being xii men of war, well appoynted, with viii or x victellers, and viii others with munition, &c.; were appointed to depart by the xxth hereof, [the very day chosen by Noailles to make his complaint,] and now this day (viz. the xiii th.) we understand that 40 sayles be past from France with men and victell. So as *ours* be lyke to come *too late*, and yet they shall away. The matter is too weighty to be trifled, and so we *all now*, at the last doo judge. Wherein I wold to God some had been of some more speedye foresight. You shall perceive by the Q.'s Majesties letter, that because it is a violation of the treaty to fortify Aymouth, ye may be the bolder to be doing with the French. If ye see that they doo not fortify, then are they to be forborn until the matter may be more earnestly followed; for else it were dangerous to begin the matter, and not to follow it with effect; and so on the other syde, if their fortifying shall seme a matter of difficulte for us hereafter to expell them, it were better to begin in tyme with them."—*Sadler's State Papers*, i. 634, 5.

sail under the command of the Marquis d'Elbœuf (a *Guise*, and brother of the Regent, designed indeed to take her place), were as much directed against England as against Scotland; in fact, they were larger than the case required, if designed only to suppress a Scottish faction, as the French *pretended*. It was under a hope of bringing on an accommodation, before the arrival of this formidable armament, that the English army and fleet were employed, and certainly rather to preserve peace than break the same, if they should not be too late, a design which ultimately was fully accomplished, as we shall have to shew. Things hung a good while in suspense, and in no small degree from the tardiness, or rather wariness, of the English; which kept the Scotch *neutrals* from declaring themselves, [see letter to Sadler from Lord Arran and Lord James, Dec. 20.] and which was felt by the English officers, and complained of in letters to the Secretary, who seemed himself to think the Queen too cautious, and too dilatory in striking a blow which might bring things to an earlier *accommodation*; in fact, if we may believe what some authors assert, the Duke of Guise and Cardinal of Lorraine were employing every art of political intrigue to prevent Elizabeth giving assistance to the Scottish Congregation, and to prevail upon her to desert them, after she had undertaken their protection; nor were they altogether unsuccessful in their attempt; for the English Queen, partly from her extreme caution and parsimony, and partly from the influence of *some of her counsellors*, was induced at first to listen to their plausible proposals; she delayed the march of her army into Scotland, and even after they had undertaken the siege of Leith, she suspended the military operations, and engaged in *premature* negotiations for peace.\* There can be no doubt, indeed, but that the Queen's object was *peace* rather than war, unless provoked by the French, which she expected might be the case, as appears not only from the

\* McCrie's Life of Knox, i. 319, and his Note II. p. 441, 2, which deserves attention, as plainly shewing the difficulties that arose from Elizabeth's repugnance to the undertaking. The complaint of Cecil, in his correspondence with Throckmorton, is curiously expressed: "The Queen's Majestie," says he, "never liketh this matter of Scotland; *you know what hangeth thereupon*; I have had such a torment herein with the Queen's Majestie, as an ague hath not in five fits so much abated."—*Forbes*, i. 454, 5. The council was much divided. "At this time," Cecil writes to Sadler, Dec. 30, 1559, "here is some contrairietie of opinion amongst counsellors: of *all the peril* is *seen* that will come by the *French greatness* in Scotland; but the *remedy* thereof is not accorded upon by all; some like a speedy and effectual empeachment, whereof the greatest part of the counsellors do allowe—some others, very few, would have us more ready with other things, and to defer hostilitie."



proceedings at Aymouth, but from a passage in one of her dispatches to the Duke of Norfolk, wherein she wishes to have no open hostility shewed on her part at the first: “which *although the French doo give us just occasion to shew*, yet be there certain respects that move us to forbear the same for one or two months if it may conveniently be.” In this she was probably more influenced by the *Catholic* and *Guisian* members of her Council than by Cecil. We do not deny that we read with concern the shuffling excuses and pretences with which the hostile movements of the army and navy were attempted to be coloured over;\* but to collect them altogether so sedulously as some authors have done, in order to bring upon the heads of Lord Burghley, Throckmorton, and others, the undivided charge of duplicity and political intrigue, is in our estimation extremely unfair. Whoever knows any thing of history, must know how continually rival nations, prepared to break a treaty, seek to colour over their designs, till the moment for action arrives; that whenever the treaty comes to be actually violated, the adversary, and not themselves, may be made to bear the

\* Dr. Lingard, whose history we more particularly cite in consequence of the credit given to it (at least by those of his own way of thinking), adduces a particular passage from Cecil’s memorial to the King of Spain, as a direct proof not only of his deceit, but of his *falsehood*. We shall repeat the passage, as we think it may be cleared of the foul imputation cast upon it: “*Ut verum fateamur, (omnesque qui hic sunt norunt esse verissimum) nos diu dubitatione aliquâ esse occupatos, an hæc discordia in Scotia inter Gallos et Scotos esset ficta, ut sub eo colore haberant in armis justum exercitum, et junctis utrinque copiis irrumperent subito in hoc regnum et præcipue caperent Berwicum.*” Now, besides that it appears from other papers, that many of the English were quite unwilling to trust the Lords of the Congregation, suspecting the very treachery Cecil alludes to, we have it on the authority of Camden, that the French commander, d’Oysel, had assembled the Scotch nobles at Eymouth (Aymouth), and proposed to them (during the heat of their own civil dissensions) the immediate invasion and conquest of England! The garrison of Eymouth had always been troublesome neighbours to Berwick, from whence it was distant only six miles; indeed the caution of the English Court, against treachery on the part of the Lords of the Congregation, is proved by their taking hostages before the march of the auxiliary army into Scotland. This alone is enough to justify the Secretary’s expression, “*Nos diu dubitatione aliqua esse occupatos, an hæc discordia inter Gallos et Scotos esset ficta, &c.*”—The very endeavours made to keep them at variance, and with which many writers are so much offended, tend at least to shew, that apprehensions constantly existed, of the Protestant Lords being almost equally inimical to England, if once they should be beguiled by the French into any union against that kingdom; and of the versatility of the Scotch parties at that period, we have a curious instance in Lodge—Lord Glencairn and his son, it seems, in Henry’s time, in the month of April, 1543 or 1544, embraced the English interests, in July took pensions from Henry, in September abandoned him, and in the ensuing spring offered their services to him again.

blame. Cecil's precautions concerning Aymouth were certainly called for by the proceedings of the French, yet we may see by a postscript added, how much he wished to conform to the treaty if it were possible. Had not a storm prevented the fleet and forces, under the Marquis d'Elbœuf,\* reaching Scotland before Admiral Winter entered the Frith, we must be very credulous indeed to believe that any peace of Chateau would have protected either the Protestants there, or (perhaps) England itself. If we knew all that was passing in France at the time, as well as we know what passed in England (through the care of no man so much as Lord Burghley, in his extraordinary preservation of public papers), we should scarcely fail, we think, to discover quite as much duplicity and political intrigue on the side of the French as of the English; the *Gallica fides* having generally been as loudly stigmatized by modern diplomatists and statesmen, as ever the *Punica fides* could be by the ancients.†

To shew that something of this nature was going on, on the other side, though our own Ministers are commonly the most censured, because they were the *least deceived*, by being constantly on their guard, we shall copy another entry from Lord Burghley's notes, just after the entrance of the English army into Scotland.

“April. Bishop of Valence and De *Cevre*, leger ambassadors from France, moved the Queen to revoq her army.

“—— 10. M. de Glason came and *joined with the Bishop of Aquila* to move revocation of the army out of Scotland, but *Glason, privately, to my Lord Admiral and me the Secretary, counselled us to the contrary.*”‡

\* In Nov. or Dec. 1559, the Marquis d'Elbœuf had actually embarked for Scotland, with a great force, but after coming within sight of Scotland, the transports were scattered by a storm, and either wrecked on the coast of Holland, or driven back to France; about nine hundred men, under M. de Mortigues, were all that reached Scotland: as to the various, and often contradictory, accounts of these transactions, see Dr. Cook's note in his *History of the Scottish Reformation*, Vol. ii. p. 243.

† When Sir Ralph Sadler acted as Minister to Henry VIII., and when both, notwithstanding the vigilance, acuteness, and spirit of the former, were duped by the Popish party, the Queen Dowager, &c., we meet continually in his letters with such expressions as follow:—“But what will follow, God knoweth; for I think never men had to do with such people.”—“This they *say*, but how it will prove God knoweth.” And in a letter from Lord Wharton to Lord Shrewsbury about the same time, viz. 1544, printed by Lodge, he writes, “I have thought good to advertise your Lordship hereof, albeit they be all so false, that I know not well what to write or say.” Of the Queen Regent, Arran was used to observe, “as she is both subtle and wily, so she hath a vengeable engine and wit to work her purpose.”

‡ See in Forbes, vol. i. 402. The Responsio ad petitiones D. Glasion et Episcopi Aquilan

We have here then, not English, but foreign authority to adduce for *foreign* duplicity and stratagem; for this M. de Glason, as Lord Burghley calls him, was the Spanish Minister who had interposed, in order to bring about an accommodation between the French and English. On one hand he joins the French in proposing the revocation of the English army, and on the other counsels exactly the contrary; not without reason, for Philip his master had almost as much to dread from the French successes in Scotland as Elizabeth. Throckmorton gives a high character of this M. de Glasion (as he calls him; the most proper name seems to be *de Glaion*) in a letter to the Queen, from Amboise, March 15, 1559. Forbes, i. 363; and we have as good authority to produce for the policy of England, in trying to hinder any accommodation between the Scots and French, while the security of England should remain unprovided for. For the following is the remark of the French historian Daniel: "If France and Scotland had remained in tranquillity, England was in danger of being attacked from *two* quarters at once, and disturbed at *home* by the still numerous adherents of the old religion." Hence may be seen, says the author of the Life and Reign of Elizabeth, what was the design of the Princes of Lorraine in sending a French army into Scotland. It was to preserve the *peace of that kingdom*, that is, *to render it entirely subject to France*, in order to attack England from that side. This must ever be remembered, if it be desired to understand perfectly Elizabeth's history.

It is impossible, we think, to have any doubt, but that the French were seeking

Oratorum Regis Catholici.—It is an admirable paper, Ex autograph. manu *Cecillii* exarato. This Spanish Envoy was represented by the Spanish Minister at Paris, to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, to be a man of profound wisdom, and fully sensible of the importance of preserving peace between the Low Countries and England. Dr. Cook's account of this answer of Cecil is too complimentary to the latter to be omitted. "While these men, Lord Montague and Sir Thomas Chamberlayn, were labouring to conciliate Philip, *Cecil*, in a most able and elegant Latin memorial, answered the declaration of De Glasion. In this answer the conduct of Elizabeth is justified, her forbearance is extolled, the impracticability of a scheme which had been proposed by De Glasion to unite some Spanish forces with the troops of France in Scotland, which might prevent any attempt upon England after the rebels were subdued, is demonstrated, and the real objects of the Queen for acting as she had done are explicitly avowed. This memorial seems to have satisfied the Spanish Ambassador; indeed, it has been suspected that he was not averse to the schemes of Elizabeth with respect to Scotland; his master's antipathy to France having in some degree overcome the detestation with which he naturally regarded the Scottish Lords, who, in his eyes, were guilty of what he esteemed the two greatest crimes which could disgrace human nature—heresy and rebellion.



to make Scotland their own. The memorable words of the Queen Regent, reported by her own herald, to the Lords of the Congregation, were much too significant to be misunderstood. "She wondered that any should presume to command her in that kingdom, which needed not to be *conquered by force*, being already *conquered by marriage*."\* Most imprudent words, but fortunately such as are calculated to throw no small light upon this embarrassed portion of history.

In further vindication of the views and proceedings of Elizabeth's great Minister, with regard to Scotland at this period, we cannot forbear transcribing the following very important, though long passage, from Dr. McCrie's Life of Knox; it refers to the period of Knox's return from the Continent in 1559. We have already shewn that he was no favourite with Elizabeth; he endeavoured to return through England, and she would not allow it. This angered him not a little, as might be expected from his irritable or sanguine temper. "England has refused me," he writes in a letter from Dieppe, April 6, 1559, "and yet I have been a secret and assured friend to thee, O England, in cases which thyself could not have remedied." But, continues his able biographer, "greater designs occupied his mind, and engrossed his attention. It was not for the sake of personal safety, nor from the vanity of appearing at Court, that he desired to pass through England; he felt the natural wish to visit his old acquaintances in that country, and was anxious for an opportunity of once more addressing those to whom he had preached, especially at Newcastle and Berwick. But there was another object which he had still more at heart, and in which the welfare of both England and Scotland were concerned.

"Notwithstanding the flattering accounts which he had received of the favourable disposition of the Queen Regent towards the Protestants, and the directions which he sent them to cultivate this, he seems to have always entertained suspicions of the sincerity of her professions. Since he left Geneva, these suspicions had been confirmed; and the information which he had procured in travelling through France conspired with intelligence which he had lately received from Scotland to convince him, that the immediate suppression of

\* It is curious to read Chalmers' comment on the course England took to avert the designs of France at this time. "Upon what moral principle," he asks, "did Elizabeth and Cecil act?—upon none: their principle was *profligacy in the extreme*." Where could be the profligacy of preventing Scotland being *conquered*, either by *force* or *marriage*, to the ruin of England?—We are thoroughly persuaded that, upon this occasion, Elizabeth, through her minister *Cecil*, was the true guardian of the *liberties* of both countries.

the Reformation in his native country, and the consequent suppression in the neighbouring kingdom, were intended. The plan projected by the gigantic ambition of the Princes of Lorraine, brothers of the Queen Regent of Scotland, has been developed and described, with great accuracy and ability, by a celebrated modern historian.\* Suffice it to say here, that their counsels had determined the French Court to set up the claims of the young Queen of Scots to the Crown of England; to attack Elizabeth, and wrest the Sceptre from her hands, under the pretext that she was a bastard and a heretic; and to commence their operations by suppressing the Reformation, and establishing the French influence in Scotland, as the best preparative to an attack upon the dominions of the English Queen. Knox, in the course of his journeys through France, had formed an acquaintance with certain persons about the Court, and by their means had gained some knowledge of this plan. He was convinced the Scottish Reformers were unable to resist the power which France might bring against them; and that it was no less the interest than the duty of the English Court to afford them the most effectual support. But he was afraid that a selfish and narrow policy might prevent them from doing this, until it was too late; and was therefore anxious to call their attention to this subject at an early period, and to put them in possession of the facts that had come to his knowledge.

“The assistance which Elizabeth granted to the Scottish Protestants, in the year 1560, was dictated by the soundest policy. It baffled and defeated the designs of her enemies at the very outset; it gave her influence over Scotland, which all her predecessors could not obtain by the terror of their arms, nor the influence of their money; and it secured the stability of her government, by extending and strengthening the Protestant interest—the principal pillar on which it rested. And it reflects not a little credit on our Reformer’s sagacity, that he had conceived this plan at so early a period, was the first person who proposed it, and persisted, in spite of great discouragements, to urge its adoption, until his endeavours were ultimately crowned with success.”

Deeply impressed, it seems, with these considerations, Knox resolved, although he had already been twice repulsed, to brook the mortification, and make another attempt to obtain an interview with some confidential agent of the English Government. With this view, he, on the 10th of April, wrote a letter to Secretary Cecil, with whom he had been personally acquainted, during his residence in London.

We need not give the letter at large; it is sufficient to observe, that this latter attempt failed, as well as the former; and in fact, Cecil must have known, that the English Court was no place for Knox to appear in. Besides the displeasure of Elizabeth, there were too many Catholics in the Council, and about the Court, to allow of his advice receiving any adequate attention, much less encouragement; but we have cited the passage, as bearing respectable testimony, on the part of Scottish men both ancient and modern, to the good policy of England, in resisting the attempts of the French, to assume to themselves the Government of Scotland, in Mary's name.\* We have already produced the testimony of Frenchmen to the insidious character of their proceedings. Dr. McCrie himself very justly observes, that the English suffered themselves to be *amused* at the treaty of Chateau Cambrensis, while the Courts of France and Spain concerted measures dangerous to England, and to the whole Protestant interest. We grant that they *appear* to have been amused, but in the state of the kingdom, to which it had been reduced by Mary, it was good policy not to subject the English interests, at that time, to be quite abandoned by Philip, which was an object with the French, and one which indeed, as we have before had occasion to remark, they were endeavouring to accomplish, by every means in their power. It was better to become a party at all events to that treaty, even with the *temporary* loss of Calais, as the treaty implied, but which it is well known the French never meant to regard. Indeed their own historians, to cover their designs, have continually misrepresented the express obligation of the treaty, as is well shewn, with respect to *Mezerai* and *Father Daniel*, by Rapin.

But while England, for her own security, as it appeared to her wisest Statesman, interfered in the dispute between the Protestants of Scotland and the Regent, or rather the French Court, the door of negotiation was not shut against the latter, but due time given to Francis to withdraw his troops before they proceeded to extremities; nor was the opportunity altogether neglected by the French King, who, with the view of checking the hostile preparations of the English, sent over the celebrated Bishop of Valence, Monluc, of whose unsatisfactory and suspicious conduct the Council, March 22d, 1559, gave notice to the Duke of Norfolk, in a letter indorsed by the Secretary, to the following effect:

“The occasion of Sir Nicholas Strange's longer tarieing here, than my Lord of Norfolke looked for, proceeded of divers accidents in the French proceed-

\* See also Cook's History of the Reformation in Scotland.



ings here with the Quenes Majestie, tending to persuade and intice her to surceasse from all hostilitie; for which purpose, the better to bring it to passe, the French King has sent hither of late one M. Monluc, Bishop of Valence, whose persuasions and excuses for theyr injuries don to her Majestie, in gyving her armes, and usurping her title and state, are so vayne and evill grounded, that it is well perceaved they have sought and do seeke nothing els by their talke but to wyinne tyme for themselves, which hathe been hitherto loste of our partes, and now therefore with more speede to be recovered."

Professions of amity, while preparations are making for war, have so continually been known to enter into diplomatic communications, that we can only cease to wonder at such an apparent breach of honour and confidence, when we come to know, that they have scarcely in any age been considered as sincere, and have generally been so reciprocal, as to leave little room for one party to blame the other. England and France stood clearly in this situation at this time; they both made professions of amity, though it seemed impossible to maintain it; but it can scarcely be doubted, that the preparations and designs of England were decidedly *defensive*, as against the projects of France, which appeared to be threatening, in a most bare-faced manner, the liberties and independence as well of England as of Scotland.

Dr. Cook, whose work we often cite, after noticing the dissimulation both of Elizabeth and the French Court, as far as regarded their mutual *professions*, observes, "It was the happiness of Elizabeth to be served by Ministers, not only devoted to her interest, and ambitious, through the most faithful discharge of their duty, to be honoured with her approbation, but who were possessed of the most splendid talents, and who had frequently exercised these talents in *unravelling the intrigues*, and tracing the *crooked policy* to which France delighted to resort."

One of these ministers was Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, who being sent to Paris about this time, had the best opportunities of ascertaining the views of the French Court, and the characters of the persons employed by it. We have already seen from Lord Burghley's notes, April 1559, that the Bishop of Valence, Monluc, who appears to have come to England March the 12th, was assisted by a leger ambassador, as he calls him, De Cevre (De Sevre\*), and on March 2, we find from the same notes, that "a treaty with De Cevre" was on foot, "for the revocation of the English army, and the French also, out of Scotland; but," says the note, "De Cevre delayeth." This minister, Throck-

\* His own signature may be seen in Forbes, i. 454.

morton had encountered upon his road to Paris, and the character he gave of him, in his correspondence with Cecil, and in his dispatches to the Council, is too curious to be omitted.

“If ear be given to honied words—if sweet language will persuade—if speeches, well applied and couched, will be believed—if large offers of things and effect of nothing will work, now shall your Lordships know, that he that can do all these things is now arrived among you; now shall you well perceive that the enchanter is come to hand, and will not fail to apply his whole power, to work that which he can as cunningly handle as any man in Europe. This man hath from his youth been trained up in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Almain, and all other places where wisdom and experience are to be learned; he knoweth Scotland as well as the countryman; *our* country is not unknown to him; he speaketh many tongues; he hath not been in these countries to learn the tongues only, but he hath so, by experience and good judgment, bridled his own nature and affectioned passions, wherewith this nation is full fraught, that he is no more French by outward show than he is Italian, no more Italian than Spaniard, no more Spaniard in pride than Dutch, nor seemeth to be more malicious nor suspicious, than if he never dealt with any that are touched therewith; and as for sobriety, I need no otherwise describe him, than he well sheweth; having these things rare in this nation, he is, in my opinion, kept in store as a select vessel, to be employed in such time as this is, and to be alone maker of a *dissembled friendship*, and a *soon broken peace*.”

This then was one of the negotiators sent from France upon the occasion, and his colleague was almost as rare an instance, to say the least, of diplomatic artifice, shrewdness, and ability; of which a very curious account may be seen in d'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*, where his talents appear to have been called forth, upon a most extraordinary occasion, the procurement of the crown of Poland for the Duke d'Anjou, afterwards King Henry III. In Melvil's *Memoirs* he makes a curious figure, and indeed his character and talents appear to have been well suited to the age in which he lived, and the country and calling to which he belonged.

Sir William Cecil having had the task assigned him of negotiating a peace with these two intriguing personages, it cannot be out of place, to notice their characters rather more particularly than might otherwise have appeared necessary.

Throckmorton, in the accounts he sent to England of the character of De

Sevre, assured Cecil and the Council generally, that the hatred of the House of Guise to Elizabeth would never be removed ; and that amidst all their professions of friendship, and all their efforts to conciliate, they were conducting their warlike preparations with the most unremitting activity ; and to mark more strongly the characters of those with whom England at this time had to deal, he assures the Council that amidst all these preparations for war, and especially for reinforcing the French army in Scotland, the Cardinal of Lorrain *protested* that he was quite at a loss to know the grounds of Elizabeth's *suspicions*, and even went so far as to pretend to have been quite ignorant, till Throckmorton informed him of it, of the assumption of the arms and titles of England, by Francis and Mary. Throckmorton, as a trusty and observing Minister, admonished the Queen's Council not to trust "the fawnings," as he called them, of the French Court, or its Ministers, as he was fully persuaded they were only seeking to gain time, and to throw Elizabeth off her guard.

And indeed it would appear that they had nearly accomplished the latter points ; and that the "honied words," "sweet language," "well applied speeches," and "large offers," of De Sevre, had well nigh turned the Queen herself aside from the support of the Confederate Lords in Scotland ; the great aim and object of the House of Lorrain.\* We must forgive Elizabeth, for having a scruple to support rebels as such ; but the great question was, did the Lords of the Congregation really stand in the light of rebels ? were they not so loyal to their *country*, her rights and liberties, as to be fairly maintaining also the cause of their Sovereign, could she have been delivered from the trammels of a *foreign* connexion, in all ways inimical to the *independence* of Scotland. In judging of these points, there is no need to seek an excuse for their proceedings, in the peculiar spirit of those times, which is certainly required to excuse many, very many transactions of the *sixteenth* century. A jealousy of foreign connexions, and foreign interference, is, in all countries, as much a principle of modern times, as of those which are past ; we must consider besides, that the Lords of the Congregation had at this period a *new* liberty, as it were, to assert, in support of their *religious opinions* ; a liberty long trampled upon, and indeed almost entirely subdued, by an usurped authority, which the imme-

\* In a conference De Sevre had with Elizabeth, and which was continued to an unusual length, she seems to have been so unable to escape entirely from his ensnaring and ambiguous speeches, as actually to have been obliged to send Sir William Cecil to answer him more fully and more explicitly, as may be seen by papers still in existence.



diate connexions and relatives of their Queen were bent upon supporting, but from which other nations had nobly emancipated themselves, and, as they must sometimes have reflected, not without the immediate and powerful assistance of the French themselves; for it is certainly remarkable, that while Elizabeth and her Ministers have been blamed for upholding the Scottish Protestants against the power of France, a measure upon which the security of her crown, her kingdom, and her person appear constantly to have depended, the Catholic King and Court of France had been assisting the German Protestants against the head of the Empire, merely to prevent the too great aggrandisement of the latter, as a neighbour to France.—We must not look to isolated facts, to account for the English policy at this time, we should invariably look to the state of Europe in general; to the *examples* England had before her eyes, and the *perpetual warnings* she was in the way of receiving, as the subtle intrigues and rancorous hatred of foreign Courts became more and more known, through the vigilance of her ambassadors, and their frequent detection of plots and conspiracies.

Twelve days after the arrival of the Bishop of Valence, *viz.* on the 24th of March, 1559, we find, in Lord Burghley's notes, the entry following:—

“ March 24. A proclamation by hir Majesty to declare hir mind to keep peace both with France and Scotland, notwithstanding the occasions given by the Fr. King and his wife, the Q. of Scotts, in claiming the title to the Crown.”

This proclamation is to be seen at length in Haynes's Burghley Papers, taken from a minute of Secretary Cecil and Sir William Petre; and as the original is in the hand-writing of the former, it must not be passed by without some observations; especially as, in most other instances, what appears extremely judicious and wise to one party, is deprecated as exactly the contrary by writers of a different stamp. Dr. Lingard calls it “ a most extraordinary state paper, entitled a Declaration of Peace, but intended as a Justification of War; it made a distinction between the French King and Queen and their Ministers; the former were the friends of Elizabeth, who strictly forbade any injury to be offered to their subjects: the latter were her enemies; and to defeat their ambitious views, she had taken up arms, and would not lay them down till she had expelled every French soldier from the realm of Scotland.”

Wishing only to do common justice to the framers of this celebrated memorial, and especially to the principal author of it, Sir William *Cecil*, we shall let it speak for itself, by inserting such parts of it as seem to bear most immediately upon the exact circumstances of the case. It begins with observing how exceed-

ingly obvious it had for some time appeared, not only to the natural born subjects of the Crown of England, but to strangers in all parts of Christendom, that, by many occasions, the French had given ground to doubt and fear an invasion of England by the way of Scotland, rendering it thereby necessary for the Queen, with all speed, to apply convenient power to withstand the same. "Yet," it proceeds, "the Q.'s most excellent Majestie, considering that ther may be diversitie of opinions conceived of her proceedings in this behalfe, heth thought mete breafly and playnly to notifie hir Majeste's certayne purpose and intent, with the just occasion given thereof."

"First hir Majestie—is content to thinke that the injurious pretences, made by the *Q. of Scotland* to this realm—hath been bred and issued only out of the hearts of the principalls of the House of *Guise*, to whom the chief governance of the crowne of France now of late *hath happened*; and that neither the French *King*, being by reason of his *yong yeres*, not so capable of such an enterprise, nor the *Quene of Scotts his wief*, also being in her *minoritie*, nor yet the *princes of the blud royal*, and other estates of France (to whom heretofore in auncient tyme the Governance of the affaires of that realm in the king's minoritie hath belonged) have imagined and intended of themselves suche an unjust, unprobable, and so dangerous an enterprise and attempte as this is, and appereth to be to all indifferent men." It then notices the assumption of the arms and titles so often mentioned before, and which the *Princes of the Kings blud* in France, and other great personages there, were reported to have rather discouraged than advised; it proceeds to the attempts making in Scotland, "to enterprise the eviction of the Crowne of Scotland, out of the power of the naturall people of the land; and thereby to procede with such force, as under that collour they have already partly, and partly hereafter meane to send thither, to invade this kingdom of England; which although they have caused to be unjustly and dishonorably claymed so many ways by their Neice, yet they well know that otherwise, than by the way of Scotland, they can never effectually, according to their desires, offend with any evident danger.—Therefore her Majestie—taking these insolent attempts to be but the abuse of the said house of *Guise*, during the minoritie of both king and queen, without any consent of the greater states of France—doth give to understand to all manner of people, that although her Majestie hath byn forced to put in order; to her great charge, certayn forces both by sea and land, for the save garde of hir kingdome, being thus impeched and challenged by words, and so approached

with force, and menaced with much greater from day to day, yet hir Majestie meaneth not, nor intendeth any manner of crueltie, hostilitie, or warre; but only seeketh and wisheth, and so hath divers tymes playnly and frendly required of the Cardinall of *Lorrayn* and his brother, and by means of them, of the *French King* also, that these insolent titles and claymes might cease and be revoked; and that ther might be, such a quiet and *naturall* governance graunted to the *people* of *Scotland*, that they might lyve in their due obedience to their Sovereign Lady (which they offer) without further *oppression* and fear of *conquest*; and consequently that the men of warre of *France* in *Scotland* might be revoked, being by reason of the former proceedings of *France*, in theyr claymes against this kingdome, over daungerous to be suffered so nigh *England*; and for the more speed therein, it hath been offered that they should also have safe conduct, by water or by land, or by bothe, with all favour and suertie, that might be shewed, or devised for their departure; and according to their cessing from armes, hir Majesties by sea and land, should also at one instant accordingly cease and be ceassed, and thereby all unkindness to be buried and forgotten, and a stable peace made.

“To whiche godly, reasonable and honorable, sundry requests, hir Majestie can by no meanes get any sufficient Answer, although moche tyme hath bynn herein spent, to hir Majestie’s excessive charge, and to the manifest delay of Concord. And finally, hir Majestie declareth, that she doth and will kepe, and contyneu good peace with the Kingdome of France, and the Kingdome of Scotland, as long as no playn Invasion shall be made by any of them upon hir Countries, Dominions, or People; and the French Men of Warre, that will withstand the same, may departe thens without Harme and in suertie; and if they will not, then hir Majestie must, of necessitie, after all these other good Means used, and after all these Delays made by France, attempt to compel them to departe thence; and otherwise to shew no extremitie nor violence to any Manner of Person of France or Scotland; and therefore hir Majestie straytely chargeth all manner hir subjects, of what estate soeuer they be, that they shall use with favour and friendship, all the French King’s Realme, in such sorte as in Tymes of best peace hath bynn and ought to be used, except they shall be provoked by any hostilitie of any of the parte of France to defend themselves or their Countrey. And likewise, that all her Majestie’s subjects shall use good and honourable speache of the Kingdom and Nation of France; and although these late intollerable injuries hath bynn committed in France against



this Crown of England, yet to judge thereof no otherwise, than hir Majestie of hir good Nature is pleased to thinke and judge. And finally, they shall make no other preparations to Warre, but onely suche as may serve for the Defense of suche wrongs or attempts, as perchance shall be made, contrary to her Majestie's Expectation, upon having in their hands the principall Governance of the King and Quene, untill it shall further appere, whither the said Kingdome and Nation of France shall meane any further playn Invasion of this Realme, and so hir Majestie's present Opinion be misconceyved. Wherof although hir Majestie woold be sorry for the hinderance of common peace in Christendome, which she most favoreth; yet it is not to be doubted that Almighty God shall assist the power of this Kingdom to escape all suche dangers, and honorably, as case shall require, to avenge itself. And for better intelligence herof, to all manner of persons, hir Majestie hath willed this to be proclaimed in English and French, that, although the same have ben especially declared to the French King, and to the said Principalls of *Guise* in France, and also to the Dowager Quene of Scotland, and to all the Ambassadors of France here resident, (whereunto no sufficient Aunswer can be obtayned) yet, it shuld not be hid from others, that percase might be induced otherwise to thinke or judge than the very truthe is. Given at Westminster, the 24th of March 1559. God save the Quene."

We cannot help thinking this might as fairly be called a Declaration of Peace, as a Justification of War. The object certainly was to drive the French farther from the most vulnerable part of England, on grounds of suspicion, furnished by the French themselves. The Family of *Guise* most undoubtedly had challenged the Crown of England,\* as the just inheritance of their niece; Scotland was the most practicable way to it, and in endeavouring to obtain it in that direction, they were prepared to tyrannize over Scotland, to contemn all those who from their birth might most reasonably have looked to be entrusted with the governance of the realm in the Queen's absence, to set at nought all pretensions to a *natural* governance, and, above all, to extirpate as heretics a party

\* See the Memorial for the Queen, May 2, 1560, taken from a copy indorsed by Cecil, in Forbes, Vol. i. 420, beginning, "The French Queen hath all this last year borne the arms of England, as Queen of England, by all manner of ways convenient to notify the same; by her own speech; by her ushers; by her own writings, private and public; by inscriptions in all her triumphs; by her heralds. The French King also hath *jointly* in grants and commissions, &c. dated the same ANNO REGNI NOSTRI ANGLIÆ ET HIBERNIÆ PRIMO."

having, by this time, at its head, the prime nobility of the Kingdom; and which, on account of its religious principles and professions, might reasonably be looked to, as a formidable and respectable barrier to England, against the encroachments and well-known purposes of France. The weakness of the Scottish frontier ought to be taken into consideration; the proclamation presumes that the French Court meant to take advantage of that weakness, with a sort of spirited contempt of all attacks *elsewhere*. The Queen of Scot's title to the English Crown was, if valid and good, as good any where else as in Scotland; but the push was, to all appearance, and by all the reports made to Government, reserved for Scotland; "for that they well know," says the Proclamation, "that otherwise than by the way of Scotland, they can never effectually, according to their desires, offend, with any evident danger;" that is to *England*, which it required some courage to say, in the *then* unprovided state of the kingdom, and considering that the French forces, ejected from Scotland, might be turned against England elsewhere. Scotland was the most vulnerable point to England.

With those who are constantly bent upon throwing all the blame upon Elizabeth, her council, her great minister *Cecil*, and her vigilant and able ambassadors, it seems to be forgotten, that not to provide against danger, not to foresee danger, not to be suspicious of neighbours,\* is the very acmé of

\* Among the ministers or diplomatists of Elizabeth, who were forward to guard her against the ambitious designs of the house of *Guise*, there was one, to whom the *Catholic* writers can have no fair reason to object; we mean Dr. Wotton, Dean of Canterbury and York; the testimony of this very able man, may with no small propriety be adduced in vindication, not only of the above proclamation, but of the constant care which *Cecil* took to ward off the dangers to be apprehended from the ambitious projects of the *Guises*. The letter was written only two months after the death of Mary, by one of her own accredited ministers, a Papist and dignitary of the Church. It was addressed to *Cecil*, the *new minister* of the *new Queen*, both being Protestants; whereby we may collect these two facts; first, that *Cecil* had so conducted himself under Mary, as to merit the confidence of her old counsellors, and secondly, that as a Catholic, there was no want of loyalty towards Elizabeth in the writer of the letter; he thus then expresses his sentiments, as a man of observation and experience, with regard to the designs and ambitious projects of the *Guises*:—

"Who shal consyder diligentllye these things, canne not as I thinke, but sumwhat suspecte the French offers; yea, though they be at first leering, plaisant, and sweete: and chiefly considering that the Howse of Guises greatnesse and authorite dependith chieflye upon the great commodite that France hath, and lokith to have by this marriage of Scotland, and therefor whatsoever they shal saye, singe, or pype, theyr meaning and yntent canne be none other, but to seeke all the means possible to encrease the powre and honour of theyr neece the Queen of

weakness in a statesman; “qui vult decipi, decipiatur,” is a maxim, of which diplomatists should never be unmindful. As far as it is possible for ourselves to form any correct judgment of the transactions in Scotland, of which we are writing, we should decidedly say, the Queen’s proclamation was borne out by facts; perfectly *pacific* if the French chose to be so, upon grounds of undoubted security to England; but otherwise, if by the insolence of the French Court, or the most notorious duplicity, they should be working in secret any detriment to the Queen’s crown, her just rights, or the freedom of her subjects; to use the words of a modern writer of no small celebrity, as a friend to liberty (the Abbé de *Mably*), we may truly say of the times of which we are writing, “L’art de negocier n’etoit encore, que l’art d’intriguer;”<sup>\*</sup> and more strongly as to the means of resisting premeditated mischief, “Je l’avoue : la *vertu* dénuée de force ne passe que pour *foiblesse* : et un état qui ne se défendrait contre des voisins puissans, que par sa *justice* et sa *moderation*, seroit tôt ou tard *opprimé*.”

If Lord Burghley (Sir W. Cecil as he then was) offended, as the passage we have cited from Dr. Lingard’s history implies, by *making a distinction between the French King and Queen, and their Ministers*, the remark of the Cardinal de Lorraine, referred to in his note‡ (65), shews that they were not backward, on the other side the water, to adopt the same measure of defence.

“It is a poor revenge,” said he to the English minister, Throckmorton, “that hath been used of late by your proclamation in England against my brother

Scotts, and of her posteritye; which will be the securityt and chief staffe and pillar that the Howse of Guyse shall have to blame and to trust to; and for the encrease and advancement of theyr neeces autorite what cowde they wyshe more, than that England mighte be brought under France by the pretence of the Queen of Scotts faynidde title to the crowne of England? and therefor whosoever canne be otherwyse inducidde to beleve of the Howse of *Guyse*, is, yn my minde, very farre deceyvid; yea, although they wolde shew to be content, that that tytyle shold be renounced: for I have seene menne that use to leape: they go a good way back to leape the further; and so I feare, that though they shuld use any such renunciation (which yndeede can be of none effect, for that the Scottish Quene is under yeres), yet that shuld be done to leape further; that is to say, not for bicause the renunciation shuld take place yndeede, but onlye thereby to worke so that they the better come to theyr purpose. Yf you wolde imagyne a treatye to be made, whereyn are many and divers articles conteynid, and amongst other such a renunciation; you know, that yf one article of that treatye be broken, that all the rest, renunciation and all, is voyde and of none effecte, and the French, though they ever breake and gyve occasion first to breake; yet they ever beare the other yn hande, that the other have broken first: and so commenlye all treaties deludidde and frustatidde that are made with them.”

<sup>\*</sup> De Principes des Negociations.



and me; but we take it that it is *not the Queenes doing*, but the perswasion of *thre or foure about her*; and as I trost to see shortlie that she woll be better advised, so we hope, that er it be long, she will put her hand to punysh them for gyving her such advice.”—*Forbes*, i. 423. Could there any stronger instance be adduced, of making, what Dr. Lingard calls, a *distinction between the Queen and her Ministers*?

But the fact really is, that the *Guises* were, at this time, the predominant party in the French Court, so much so, indeed, as to excite great jealousies and heart-burnings amongst those who saw with disgust the transfer of the royal power; the Queen Mother herself being one, the King of Navarre, and his brother the Prince de Condé also;\* but more particularly the Constable Montmorency, the great enemy of the *Guises*, the great friend and favourite of Henry II., and so far the friend of England, that he had particularly interposed to prevent, if he could, the assumption of the English arms and titles by Francis and Mary. Camden, alluding to the part Elizabeth took at this time, and her *proclamation in particular*, says, from this time she became “to her friends an admiration, and terror to her foès.”

We have already noticed one extraordinary entry in Lord Burghley’s notes, relative to the Spanish ministers, the Bishop of Aquila, and M. Glasion; but we have cause to repeat it: “April 10. [1560] M. de Glason came and joyned with the Bishop of Aquila to move revocation of the army out of Scotland, but Glason, *privately to my Lord Admiral, and me the Secretary*, counselled us to the *contrary*.”

In Haynes’s Burghley papers are to be seen three remarkable documents upon this head. The first is entitled, the Spanish Ambassador’s declaration to Sir Francis Knollys, April 8, 1560, indorsed by Secretary *Cecil*. The second is the answer to this declaration from a minute of Secretary *Cecil*; and the third, the “bref information to M. de Glasion of the *Queenes* proceedings from the begynning;” already mentioned.

These papers are too long to introduce here, but they may be easily read in Haynes; and the principal intelligence to be drawn from them, as applicable to the subject of this Memoir, seems to us to be, that the policy of England, with regard to the designs of the *French* in *Scotland*, was perfectly understood on the *Continent*; that the danger to which England might be exposed by Scotland’s falling into the power of the French Court, then at the disposal of the *Guises*,

\* See *Dictionnaire Historique*, art. FRANÇOIS II.

was nothing chimerical, but too apparent to be doubted, by those who were capable of taking a comprehensive view of the precise state of affairs. From the first paper it appears, that King Philip judged it to be quite right ("alloweth well," is the expression in the original) that the Queen should stand upon her guard; and to the end she might have her realm in safety, "*out of the danger of the French*," Glasion was sent to mediate a peace. But, that Philip would aid the French in chastising the *rebels* there, if Elizabeth should take part with them.

We see here how much might depend on the term *rebels*.\* If the Lords of the Congregation, and Protestants generally, were decidedly to be regarded as rebels, Elizabeth was likely to be as much against them as Philip. Glasion's commission, as it stood at this time, seemed to lay him under an obligation to join his colleague, the Bishop of Aquila, and the French negotiators, in soliciting the Queen to revoke her army; but as *his own ideas* were not clear upon this head, he expressed a desire, that if the army were *not* revoked, it might be restrained from acting for forty or fifty days, to afford him an opportunity of fresh communications with his Sovereign.

The remainder of the paper contains, as we take it, Sir Francis Knollys' own opinion upon the answer to be given to the Ambassador; it touches, of course, upon the claim to the English Crown on the part of Mary, incited thereto by her maternal relatives; and on the danger that might ensue from the too near neighbourhood of the French forces, ("Men of Warre," in *Scotland*), and of the necessity therefore, under which the Queen lay, of procuring, or compelling their removal, if fair means would not do; observing, however, that she had offered to the French ambassadors to withdraw her troops, if the French would do the same, "upon the dewe acknowledging by the said Skottes of their allegiance unto theyre Quene, and to hyr husband the Frenche Kyng also in hyr ryght;" which, it is added, was partly by them (the ambassadors) thought reasonable. Then follows the answer suggested, more particularly as it regarded Philip.

"And unles it myght appere, that the Frenche had ruled in Skotland according to the decrees and compacts made betwene these two realmes, and that the Skottes had *rebelled* or *resisted*, without *injurie* or *breache* of compacts offered unto theym, we suppose and hope, that the Kyng Katholyke wolle not assyste,

\* See a curious passage in Sadler and Croft's letter to Sir William Cecil, Sept. 8, 1559. Sadler's Letters, vol. ii. 432. and see particularly Throckmorton's letter to the Queen.—*Forbes*, i. 336.

and ayde the Frenche to the *Chastysment* and *Bondage* of the *Skottes*, and to the satysfying of the unsatyable desyer of the Frenche, that thereby seekethe the conquest of this realme. But rather we trust that the Kyng Katholike wolle helpe to staye the gredyness of the Frenche, to the conservatyon of the Skottes in theyr *freedome* and *lybertie*, syns the Crowne of Skottland ought to retorne to the mere Skottish nation, yf the Quene dye without yssue, as hetherto she hathe none; and syns this realme shal be in dawnger of conquest, yf the Skotts shalbe brought into bondage by conquest of the Frenche."

We see nothing in this answer but what the actual state of things appeared to warrant. The liberties of the Scots, whether Catholic or Protestant, were to all appearance in great danger: *compacts had been broken* by the French, and there seemed to be a great design on foot to take the government of the kingdom out of the hands of the "mere Scottish nation." These things require constant attention. England has been reproached for her desire to foment quarrels in Scotland, merely to further her own ends; but, in all cases, we shall see the real and essential interests of Scotland were interwoven with those of England. To the moment of the last most fatal and deplorable catastrophe, foreign interference and Catholic influence were the foundation of all the troubles incident to the northern portion of the island during the sixteenth century. But to return to the papers in Haynes.

In consequence, probably, of Sir Francis Knollys' communication, the second paper, called an Answer to the Declaration of Mons. de Glasion, the Spanish ambassador, appears to have been drawn up by Sir William Cecil. The beginning is very remarkable.

"First, lyke as the King Catholique, notwithstanding the dyvers complaynts made to hym by the *French*, was pleased of mere good will towards the Queens Majesty, not only to excuse her preparations, but also to *allowe* the same: so hir Majesty thynketh surely that if he had also heard hir ambassadors, before the sending away his mynd and instructions to Monsieur de *Glasion*, he wold have not only allowed her preparations, but wold also have sent hir advise, not to indure the danger that hir realme stode in by the French proceedings in Scotland."

This passage is the more important as tending to explain the secret counsel given by De Glasion to Sir William and the Lord Admiral, which appears to be his own private opinion of the manifest designs of the French, to which his public commission did not reach. He was commissioned to mediate between the Queen and the French; and he found the revocation of the English army



insisted upon as a preliminary measure ; but being upon the spot, and, therefore, enabled the better to see through the actual designs of the French, however vanished over, he could not help privately concurring with Elizabeth's ministers in the necessity of keeping it where it was.

Elizabeth's ministers, Lord Montague, and Sir Thomas Chamberlayne, being in Spain, it was to be hoped that Philip would by that time know the actual state of affairs almost as well as M. de Glasion, and, therefore, encouragement seems in this answer to be given to the latter to expect from Philip an approval of his more private opinion in not insisting too earnestly upon the revocation of the army.

The third paper contains, therefore, such information as might the better prove to M. de Glasion the real and actual urgency of the case and grounds of the Queen's proceedings. This paper is so important, that we know not how to abridge it, especially as it touches upon the *two* hazards apparent to England : first, the invasion of the latter country by the French, after they should have overcome the Scottish Protestants, *or*, the making up of the differences subsisting between the Scots and French, which might terminate in a joint invasion of the Queen's dominions. It is impossible to judge aright of the *statesman-like* *prudence*, *foresight*, and *precaution* of Lord Burghley (so frequently, in superficial, partial, and even fictitious writings, branded with the names of *craft*, *deceit*, and *perfidy*), without a full and perfect understanding of the actual dangers with which his country and his Sovereign were incessantly threatened.

“ A breeff information to M. de Glasion, of the Quenes Majestys proceedings from the begynning.

“ First, when it was understand the last yere, sone after the peace made, that the French King was dyurse wayes provoked, by the Duke of Guise, and the Cardynall, and his sistar, the Quene Dowager in Scotland, to entitle there nece, the Quene of Scottes, to the Crown of England ; and that at length the matter was so obteyned, that by many manner of wayes it appered well to the world, what there purpose was, both in France and in Scotland ; yea contynually so advertised out of all courtes, and covertly also signified to the Quene's Majesty from the King Catholique, both by the Conte de Feria, by John de Ayalu, and by the Bishop of Aquila : hir Majesty thought to coverr hir understanding hereof, and trusted that the howse of Guise shuld not so prevaile, for there owne particular ambition, as to cause the French Kyng to enter into oppen war for the same.

“ Yet, nevertheless, when the practice increased, and that the Dolphyn and his wiffe revealed to the world this intent, by taking the arms of England, and after a despitefull manner hung them up in June last, in all oppen places of tryumphees in Parisse, yea, upon the stage where the judges sat to judge, uppon the Tornage there, and the Harrolds also of the Dolphyn proceeding his band of horsemen wer newly arrayed therewith: hir Majesty then began to looke more about hir; and yet thought not to make any oppen quarrel, but caused hir ambassador to complayne thereof, as of his own minde to the Constable, who although he made hymself ignorant thereof, because he sayd, that the Messieurs de Guise entermedled in those kynd of matters, and that the marriage was made whilst he was prisoner in Flanders; yet he willed the ambassador to forbear any furder complaynt, for he wold speke to them of Guise in it, and it shuld be remedied.

“ Hereuppon the King dyed, and then the administration of the affaires cam to the hands of the Cardynall and his brother; whereuppon followed dayly more manifestation of there purpose. For beside the universall changing of the Scottish Quene's arms in hir clothes of estate, in hir hangings, hir plate, and vessell, hir chappell, hir wrytings, hir styles, yea, hir own manifest allegations of hir right, hir evill words of the Quene's Majesty of England, against hir right, they began to make divers preparations to the sea, rigged there shipps, amassing all along the sea-coast of Pickardy and Normandy a grate quantitie of artillery, specially of brass peces, as cannons and such lyke; then also began they to send and practise secretly in *Almayn* for bands of horsmen and footmen. All these she collored under the pretense of subduing of a *few* of the nobilitie and gentlemen of Scotland, whom the Queen there sought to have put to deth for certen quarrels which she pretended against them, for matters of religion; having before licensed the same to use the freedom of their consyence (which was only in the last Lent before) to receave the Sacrament under both kynds. And in this matter it is very notorioose, how the conqueste of that realm was divers ways sought, as upon that matter there is so much to be sayd, as it is too gret shame for the French ministers there to have their practices disclosed; but that matter is to be best herd betwixt the French Kings ministers and the subjects of the land.

“ When these thyngs had thus proceeded two or or three months together, fynding every day to disclose more than another, then dyd the Quenes Majesty, uppon many deliberations had with her Counsell, fynding this matter very dan-

geroose, and lykely to break owt with spede, (specially as soon as they might convey their powers of men of warr, their victalls, munition, and artillery into Scotland,) thynk it most necessary to cawse her ships to be reviewed, and put in some order, and to send for such armore and munition, as she had bought in the Lowe Country; and further also to muster her realme, and so to begin some manner of preparations.

“Thus being past, *June, July, August, and September*, and findying that grete quantitie of vittalls, munition, and artillery was caryed in this tyme into *Scotland*, and the numbers of men caryed also thither; and now being brought into gret dowte what the *French finess* might be, to pretend a tumult in Scotland; or at the least, though some disorder wer there, the same being but a discord, for the maner of governance, and for breaking the pacts with Scotland, they might soddenly accord all those quarrells amongst themselves, and so joyn both their forces and make a sodden invasion upon England, and surprise Berwyk for this purpose: it was thought necessary to augment the garrison of Barwyk, and to survey the weakness and wants thereof, and November following, to make a preparation of all things mete, both for to furnish Barwyk, and other forts there, and to send the same by sea. Then followed also, intelligence had out of France, what grete number of shippes were prepared to conduct men into Scotland, and how La Bross and the Bishop of Amyens were also passed thither, with certayn numbers; and the Marques d’Elbœuff and Martigues shuld also, with all spede possible, passe with a grete army into Scotland; whereupon there was no way thought more convenient to prevent and withstande this so dangerous a matter, than to augment the Navy, that should go into the North, and to make them able to withstand any Enterprise to be done, &c. &c.”

The paper ends abruptly, but the information it contains is certainly very important. It bespeaks an attention to the actual danger of the country, which, perhaps at the time, might be its salvation. It is impossible, we should think, to doubt, that without such prompt attention to the strength of the kingdom in the north, facilities might have been afforded to the invasion of it by the French, and possibly, by the French and Scots united; for had the Protestant party been brought to recant, or being overcome, left the French and Scottish Catholics to act with full force upon England, it could not be supposed that any particular good-will towards the latter kingdom would have prevented their cordial co-operation in such an undertaking. England was, through the prevalence of most unfortunate jealousies, still too much regarded as Scotland’s



“Ould Enemie,” to expect much mercy from a junction of that nature, particularly at such a period. Had not the Reformation attained a footing in Scotland, nothing perhaps, at this time, could have saved England; this evidently produced a feeling towards the latter, and towards the Protestant Sovereign of the latter, which brought the people of the two kingdoms into closer contact, softened former antipathies, and produced as it were a common feeling; a feeling, as far as regarded the dangers to both countries from the ambition of the Guises, the most creditable and respectable; for it is absurd to talk of the Lords of the Congregation being *rebels*. A Regency is very different from the full Sovereignty of a kingdom; we ought, from the experience of the most modern times, to know, how fair a right the natural subjects of any well regulated state have to demur to the arbitrary appointment of a *Regent*. The Queen Mother of Scotland might have very reasonably been complimented, as she had been, with the Regency, as the widow of a deceased Sovereign, and the mother of a living one; but when the ancient rights of the kingdom, and the reversionary rights of the presumptive heirs to the Crown, were, through the connexions of such a Regent, judged to be in danger from *foreign* influence, who would venture to call the opposers of such anti-constitutional measures, *rebels*? Of the rights of conscience we have said but little, since there were sufficient *political* reasons for endeavouring to resist the arbitrary Government of a foreign Regent; but of the little chance there was of obtaining from the French permission to profess or entertain the Protestant faith, we have a good proof in the dispatches of Lord Montague and Sir-Thomas Chamberlayne, from Philip’s Court at Toledo. In one of which, when they describe the interest Philip was taking in the dispute between France, and Scotland supported by England, they write, “The French King woulde be content to leave the Quene’s Majestys’ Title and Stile—he wolde remitte and pardon the Scotts of all things past, and leave them to their auneyent liberties and government, with some personage amonge them; and that in respect of *alteration* of *Relygion*, whiche *he will not indure*, neyther this King, as we do perceive, will Counsell him thereto.” In the same Letter they observe, that the French, in order to fix Philip the more strongly on their side, had been careful to attribute all the disturbances in Scotland to the English, “as Fautors of the Protestant Religion.”—*Haynes*, 285, 6.

Monluc, Bishop of Valence, having failed in his embassy to London, as far as regarded the revocation of the English army, desired to have a safe conduct to Edinburgh, to confer with the Queen Regent, having, as he alleged, com-

mandment from the King, his master, "to travell betwixt the Queen Dowager and the Scots, for an accord and pacification of their greefs;" this was not denied him, Killegrew being appointed to accompany him, with ample directions from the Council to the Duke of Norfolk, to afford him every protection, "except he should give contrary occasion, by demonstration of any outward acts of mallice to the realms of England."

There was not, as we have before hinted, in all Europe, a more subtle, artful, or able negotiator, than this Bishop of Valence; so that it was a matter of very reasonable prudence, to keep a vigilant eye upon him. Camden says of him, that he was "a man not averse from the Protestant profession;" but how this was proved, in his negotiations upon the present occasion, we should, we must confess, be at a loss to shew, unless the French allegations afterwards—that he exceeded his commission—were true. Cecil and his coadjutor, Dr. Wotton, as we shall soon have to shew, certainly gained advantages over him in favour of the Scottish Protestants, but he threw too many impediments in the way, to make it doubtful that he was acting in behalf of the French party.

The Duke of Norfolk was not long established in the north, before he discovered the purposes of the French to be such as *Cecil* suspected; that to go through with the exploit of assisting the Protestant association, to expel the French, was, to use his own words, "the only way for the preservation of her Highnesse own person, her realm, and her honour." He plainly saw, that any waste of time, or slackness of supply, might be almost fatal to England. He ventured even to remonstrate against the parsimony of the Queen, insisting, in his letters, that unless good care were taken, the Queen's Majesty, "to save a pound, might ere longe have cause given her to spende tenn."\* "I am sure ye cann well ynoughe consider," he writes to the Secretary, "that as long as the Dowagier remayneth the Rewler, with a garrison of French, be it never so small, they may, when theyr strengthe is ready, and ours unfurnished, quickly revenge themselves of them, whom the Quenes Majestie hathe nowe taken to her protection. In this case (methinks) the Quenes Majestie's Honour and the suretie of her realme is much to be regarded: for eyther ye shall see it com to this pass, or else, for necessyties sake, the *Scots*, to make amendes, shalbe fayne to joine themselves with the *French*, to be our utmost enemyes."—The Duke wrote at the same time, and in the same strain, to the Lords of the Council.

\* Haynes, 284.

The taking of Leith from the French was, in truth, found to be a harder task, than the Government at home seemed to expect; the army was not allowed to attack Edinburgh, partly out of respect to the Queen Dowager, who had retired thither, and partly that it might the better appear that it was not its object to make conquests, but only to assist in restoring the nation to a free and willing obedience to their natural Sovereign, the Queen of Scots.

To shew, however, how perfectly at this time the French were baffled in their designs, by the proceedings of the English Government, the French Commissioners, in order to induce Elizabeth to withdraw her armies from Scotland, ventured so far as to hold out to her a prospect of the restitution of Calais, the loss of which, in the last reign, was known to have been regarded, by the English, as one of the greatest disgraces and heaviest calamities that could well have befallen their country. But Elizabeth seized the opportunity of manifesting her spirit, upon an occasion so tempting. "She answered flatly," says Camden, "that she little esteemed Calice, a poor fisher-town, in comparison of the safety and security of all Britain."

It was in the beginning of April 1560, that the English army first appeared before Leith; which, as has been before shewn, the Queen Regent had been careful to fortify, sorely against the will of the confederate Lords, it being the key of Scotland, a fit place for the landing and security of auxiliary forces, and admirably situated as a *dépôt* for provisions, ammunition, &c.

The first attacks, however, of the English and Scots united, were not so successful as to afford them the encouragement they expected; and jealousies in the English camp, if not some treachery, were supposed too much to retard matters, until the Duke of Norfolk, by a timely addition of fresh troops, rendered the desperate situation of the French so apparent, as to dispose them to listen to terms of accommodation, and which ended indeed in their acceptance of the famous treaty of Edinburgh, a treaty which, had it been subsequently ratified, might have given a different turn to the whole course of affairs, and saved Mary, perhaps, from many bitter misfortunes. To negotiate this treaty it was, that Sir William Cecil, "a learned and prudent person," as Buchanan styles him, was specially dispatched to Scotland, to treat, in conjunction with Dr. Wotton, with Montluc and M. Rochefoucauld Randon.

While the army lay before Leith, much time appeared to have been wasted, and much advantage to the English and Scots lost, by communications between the two parties, tending to a treaty, but in which the Duke did not like to



place any confidence, though of Sir Ralph Sadler, who was sent to the camp for these purposes, he judged most highly. "I have received," he wrote to the Secretary, on the 15th of April, "this daie the Quene's Majesties and your lettres, of the 9th of this moneth, by the whiche I do gather the good will that the Quene's Majestie hathe to accord these great matters with an amycable peace, for which cause her Majestie wisheth Sir Ralph Sadlyer to be sent thither, who already is gonn : of whom the Quene's Majestie doth gather no frustratt opynyon, in chusing him as the metest instrument to serve her Majestie there; who, making no comparyson, is best esteemed by the Scots, of any Englishman, and with his creditt there is hable to do most for the Quene's service."—Notwithstanding which high compliment to Sir Ralph, he speaks much more highly of the mission of Sir William himself; on which account, the whole letter indeed may reasonably be transcribed: it is dated May 27, 1560. On the 30th, Sir William quitted the Court for Scotland. The letter is as follows: "I have received your most freendlie letters of the 23d of this present, good Mr. *Secretarie*, wherein I founde nothing, but that I hope shall redownde to the honor of the Quene's Majestie, and weale of both these realmes. In the first parte, I perceave you have resolved upon a sure grownde, whiche is to send me into Scotland, with such a nombre of men, as shall be able to performe that whiche shall be committed to my charge: secundarilie, of a newe treatie, wherein I perceave you and my uncle Wooton are commissioners; which name of treaty, although dilatorie handling (alluding to the parleys before Leith) hathe made odious, yet *your* true and faythefull zeale, to bring this thing to good effect, is so well knowen, as that which afore was so displeasent, is nowe, I dare saye, because *you shall be the agent in this case*, most wished for: and if you be so to others, howe can it be, but that you must be most welcome to me; considering what a quiet it must be to me, to conferre those cares unto you, which had not been untold, if wishing might have fundered your desier. I hope, howsoever the treatie shall speed, you will not forthinke this your journey. Thus I bid you heartelie farewell. Your most beholding

"THO. NORFOLK."

"To my very loving Freende, Sir William Cecil, Knight,

"Principall Secretarie unto the Quenes Majestie."

But it is proper that we should give some more regular account of the beginning and course of these negotiations, upon which so much of the future history of the two kingdoms will be found to depend. The first attempts upon Leith,

by the English and Scots, were not attended with such success (as we have before shewn) as greatly to dispirit the French, and probably, had not the Duke of Norfolk strengthened them so opportunely as has been related, there might have been but small hope of very soon bringing the French to terms; but fortunately, at this time, the Princes of the House of Lorrain had other things to attend to at home—the conspiracy of *Amboise*, as it is commonly called, had served to awaken them to a sense of the danger in which they stood from the efforts of the French Protestants (called from this time *Hugonots*\*), and disposed them rather to stay the proceedings in Scotland, upon an apprehension that the French troops might be wanted at home. This induced them, in the King's name, to send a special and more certain commission to the Bishop of Valence and the Count de Randon, to treat of peace.

The former had made his appearance at Berwick, in the middle of the month of April, coming thither with a special recommendation from *Cecil* to the Duke of Norfolk, to secure to him every attention suitable to his rank, quality, and commission, unless he should happen to give demonstration of any outward malice against England. On the 20th of April, after some obstruction from the Lords of the Congregation, he was allowed to enter Scotland and repair to Edinburgh, the Duke of Norfolk professing, that he looked for “neyther good nor bad by his going, though accompted, amongst the Lords of *Scotland* that knowe him, one of the finest ingins in Christendome.†” He speaks afterwards of “the dissembling Bishop's venomous wordes;” which shews that he himself had no good opinion of him. He exceeded his safe-conduct by not returning at the time fixed; “so,” says the Duke, “that if he be so coleryke at his commyng to the Courte, as he hath bene here, you may soon put him to silence, with saying, that if extremitye were taken, he might be a sufficient prisoner.” He seems certainly to have been very troublesome to the Duke; for speaking afterwards of the Secretary's repair to Newcastle, in his way to the North, his Grace says in his letter, “the Bell-wether of all mischief woll meate with you by the waye, whose companye, I am sure, you cannot mysse, and if it were for half a score myles. I never had so much ado, as to use temperance with hym: he saw I did no way like his doings, nor greatly his companye, and yet I could never be rydd of his inquisitive hed. I heare that to sum points he will pleade ignorance.”—*Haynes*, 322.

\* Daniel.

† Haynes, 295.

The Secretary himself set off for Scotland on the 30th of May, with a large retinue; in his own notes the entries of this month are as follow:

“ May 6. The first assault at Leith took not good effect.

“ ——— M. de *Randon* came to joyn with de *Valence* to go into Scotland, and brought commission for themselves, and Bishop of Amiens and d'Oyzell.

“ May 10. The Queen writeth to L. Montagu, to return out of Spain.

“ ——— 30. Sir William Cecil, Knight, Secretary; and Dr. Wotton, went towards Scotland, to treat with the French Ambassadors; \* with them were joyned Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir Peter Carew.”

\* “ Some reverses of fortune at Leith, and the persuasion that the Court of France was sincere, so powerfully inclined the Queen to seek peace, that the Council could not resist her desire. That they might, however, secure all the objects of importance to England, and that no advantage in forming the Treaty might be taken by the Bishop of Valence, one of the ablest Statesmen of his age, *Cecil* was included amongst the English Commissioners, who, guided by a sense of public duty, commenced his journey to the borders on the 29th (30th) of May.”—*Cook's Reformation of Scotland*, ii. 291.

Two letters are still in existence, the contents of which appertain so entirely to this History as with no propriety to be passed over, though already in print. It will be seen, that the Secretary began his journey northward on the 29th, or, according to his own notes, on the 30th May, 1560. On the 27th he wrote thus, to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton in France:—

“ Sir,—I am fain to submit my whole stomake to Mr. Killebrew's letters. My journey is to me very strange, and diversely judged of. My friends in Council think it necessary for the matter, and convenient for me: my friends abroad think, I am herein betrayed to be sent from the Queen's Majesty. Whatsoever it is, I content myself with service; and being wearied at home, shall feel no difference of trouble abroad. If I may do good, I shall be glad; but this is so difficult, that I rather despair. The most comfort is, that by this mean shall be tried, what we shall trust unto. From Greenwich, the 27th of May 1560.

“ W. CECILL.”

On the very next day, viz. May 28, Killygrew, alluded to in the above, wrote to Throckmorton as follows:

“ Yours of the 22d of this present I received the 26th of the same; whereunto I cannot answer as now, for writing the Secretary's mind unto you; who for lack of leisure could not, though he were most willing, attend thereto; but he continueth wholly yours.

“ Upon the return of M. de Valence, the coming of Randon, and our loss at Leith, the Queen's Majesty has been so desirous of an end in this matter, as it was thought meet, for divers respects by the Council, that the Secretary should make the same; who, for his country's sake, hath been contented to take the matter in hand. The worst has been cast of his absence from hence by his friends, and at length judged for the best. I know none can love their country better; I would, the Queen's Majesty could love it so well. Mr. Secretary, and Mr. Wotton, depart Northwards to-morrow, with the French Commissioners, for the better ending of these troubles



The first Letter Sir William wrote to the Court was from Royston, to Sir William Petre, as follows :

“ Sir,—At two of the clocke in the afternoone this last of May, I am in *Royston*, in no apparent dout of health, and yet, by the foulness of the wether, afrayed to ride to *Huntyngton* until to-morrow. Hyther cam to me all theise Lettres included, which it may please you to delyvre to her Majesty. They come from the Duke of Norfolk and Sir P. Caroo.\* I send them which cam to myself from the Erle *Morton* and Mr. Caroo.\* I also send herewith a Lettre to the Quene’s Majesty, for answer to a Lettre sent by Mr. Hampton ; and so I recommend myself to you and all my good Lords and Frends. Your’s assured at command. From Royston this last of May 1560. “ W. CECILL.”

“ To the Right Honorable Sir William Petre, Knight,  
“ of her Majestie’s Privee Counsell.”

On the 2d day of June, and fourth of his journey, he writes again to Sir Wm. Petre, as follows :

“ Sir,—I am come to my howse here at *Burley*, rubbyng on betwixt helth and sickness, and yet my hart serveth me to get the mastery:”—he urges a supply of money ; “ if neede shall be, to encouradg men to fight, mony must serve ; if by Peace they shall return, it may not be spared.” Munition also he is earnest to have dispatched, and he concludes, “ I pray you, Sir, doo my humble commendations to all my Lords and the rest ; and send my Wiffe word that I have my helth very well, and in the morning doo depart hence. We trust to be at Newcastle by the 6th or 7th. This 2d of June, the daye of Comfort, by the impartying to us all of the Holy Ghost, 1560. Your’s assuredly, “ W. C.”

On the 4th of June he writes from Scrooby, purposing to be at Doncaster that night, and on the Friday following, at Newcastle. In this letter, he

in Scotland ; God send them good speed. Mr. [Sir William] Petre remaineth here. 28th May 1560.

“ HENRY KYLLYGREW.”

On the 29th, the Lords of the Council wrote a very extraordinary letter to Throckmorton, in positive contradiction of what had been communicated to the Spanish Ambassador in France, by the Cardinal of Lorrain, relative to the treatment and reception of the Bishop of Valence in England and Scotland.—*Forbes*, i. 505-6.

\* The different spelling is remarkable ; and the different titles : in Lord Burghley’s diary it is written Sir Peter *Carew*.—See the preceding page. Such variations are quite common in the original MSS. of the day.

observes to Sir Wm. Petre, "I perceyve grete lack hereaway of a Bishopp of York. I thynke if you wold move hir Majesty, she wold pass the *Congee d'Eslyer* for *Dr. Maye*. Surely the sooner it be done the better."

On the 5th of June he writes again, expecting that night to lye at Borough-bridge. In this letter he notices a curious device of the French to take advantage of the Mission of one of their Ambassadors. "We are marvellosly troobled, for that we now understand, that the trayne of Monsieur *de Randan* be allmost all *Captaynes* and *Ingyners*, which meane to be occupied both at Barwyk and in Scotland, to enter, if they can, into *Lethe*; if their salve conduct served not, they should not depart from *Newcastle*. And so I end full very—"

He writes on Thursday 6, from Northallerton, and on the 8th from *Newcastle*; at which place he and Dr. Wotton were met by the French ministers. "We have spent all this afternoone in talk with theis *Frenchmen* and have entered into many matters—much has been sayd on both parts, but consy-dering we have resolved nothing, we think not mete to molest your Lordships. We perceive that the Queen Dowager is in great perill. I, the Secretary, meane for dyvers respects, as it were by stealth, to mete to-morrow in the night, with my Lord of Norfolke at Alnwyk; and so retorning on *Monday* in the morning, we will conclude with the *French*, for their going or tarrying—."

On the 11th, they write again to the Council, through Sir W. Petre, from the same place.—"We doubte not but ye can considere, that we have to doo with men here, that leave no waye unsought for theyr purpose, and therfore we are more occupied in stopping and meeting them to our poore understandings—your Lordships shall perceave by the Quene's Majesties letters, that now we be all going into *Scotlande*; and besydes dyvers other causes, two principally move us to accorde thereunto: the one is, the danger of the Queen Dowagers Lyfe—the other is, we see that, without being nigh the place, we shall not without much spence of tyme com to an ende—we looke hourly to heare of the estate of the Queen Dowager; on Satterday, she was, as we hear say, speechless."—\*

\* She was, in fact, dead at the time this letter was written: as we find from Lord Burghley's own notes, June 10. "The English and French Commissioners met at Newcastle. The Queen Dowager died in Edinburgh Castle." There is a very interesting and affecting account of her death to be seen in Cook's History of the Reformation in Scotland. She desired to see the

On the 12th of June, the two Commissioners, Sir William Cecil and Dr. Wotton, received dispatches from the Court, earnestly recommending to them to provide for the relinquishment of the English and Irish arms and titles, as a thing touching highly the Queen's honor and estate, and to procure some better confirmation and understanding of the Treaty of Cateau, "because the *French* in those, and all other theyr promises, do serve the tyme, and contrary to good faith, pretende matters for their purpose, when they list." So very earnest does the Queen appear to have been, to obtain compensation for the affront offered her by the assumption of the titles, &c., that she was for demanding the restoration of Calais, and 500,000 crowns besides, in the way of recompense. (See Haynes, 342.) And upon the principle, of which she reminds *Cecil*, that *Nemo potest servire Deo et Mammonæ*, she would have had such Lords as had lands and lordships in France, to renounce them, and become wholly Scotch, or at least, not so connected with, or dependent upon, France. There was indeed some reason for this.

On the 15th, Sir W. Cecil writes from Berwick to the Court, as follows :

"We be so traversed with all by this French Bishop, as we can make no certayntie of our proceedings. All yesterday was spent in articles, touching our entry, our manner of treaty, the abstinence of warres; and so agreed, as we determyned to take our journey this morning. Yesternight they forbare signing of them upon cavillations, and yet gave us hope that they wold finish them by four a clock this morning; and nowe untill this howre, which is six, we cannot have speches with them, excusing themselves by long slepe; and so we ar in contention about a word; wherein we meane to have the victory, or els not to depart this daye." In this letter much blame is thrown on Sir James Crofts, for the disorderly conduct of the army.

In a letter of the 19th, from Edinburgh, the Commissioners complain much again of the trouble they have with the *French* negotiators. "Our travels

principal Lords of the Congregation, and expressed to them her concern for the calamities that had befallen the kingdom; she exhorted them to labour for peace, and procure the dismissal of both the French and English forces from Scotland; she adjured them to continue in allegiance to their Sovereign, and not renounce the ancient alliance with France; with many tears she bade them farewell, and, as if anxious to atone for her strong religious prejudices, called for Willocks, one of the reformed ministers, and died, professing to him her firm faith in the *merits* of the Redeemer. This learned historian, with much feeling, deploras the indecent manner in which her death, after the scene displayed above, was contemplated and publicly spoken of by Knox.



and debates with these *Frenchmen* be not much lesse, than theyres of the campe against the French besieged. We can get nothing but with racking and streyning; and we have it inwards; they alwayes will steale yt awaye in penning and wryting. If, on the other syde, fayre words and other, specially of the Bishop, might enter into our conceits to *believe* him, we might have with lesse care ended or this tyme, but how well God knoweth; this matter hath so many crooked points in it to accomde, consydering we deal betwixt a prince and his subjects, and we have to deal with so croked and subtle a nation, that truly we must confesse, that whatsoever we shall doe, may easily be reprehended. We see that this Counsell of Scotlande may be directed to doo any thing that the Queen's Majestie will command them, but how long that will indure, God knoweth. [To this letter there is the following *postscript*:] At length we are agreed upon our Articles, whereof we cannot send you the Copy.

“ Your Lordship's at Commandment,

“ W. CECILL, N. WOTTON.”

On the 20th of June, Sir William Petre writes from the Court, to Sir William Cecil, “ All men's expectations here and abroad dependeth uppon your doings: which I pray God may be suche, as with the Quene Majesties honor may establish us in quietness.”

The Lords of the Congregation were very wary at first in trusting to the treaty on foot: “ I fynde some,” says Sir William, in a letter to the Duke of Norfolk, “ so deeply perswaded in the matter of *religion*, as nothing can perswade them, that maye appere to hinder it.” But on the 23d of June, Sir William Cecil writes to the Court: “ This daye the *French* and the *Scottish* deputies dyning at my lodgyng, we have proceeded and accorded most part of the Articles on both their parts. Wherein our presence prevaieth much, for suerly the Lords of *Scotland* would yield almost in no doubtful manner, but to content us: and yet we do not use any perswasion to discourage them; but they understood, that we doo most covett an end by peace; and they say, their debt is so great to the Queen's Majestie, that whatsoever shal be willed to them, in her Majestie's name, they will doo it to the hazard of the liffes and lands—We fynd a great commoditie in the Lord James, and the Lord Ledyngton,\* who be well content to followe our opinions in any thyng. Suerly the Lord James is a gentleman of great worthiness.”

\* On the 25th he writes again, “ My Lord of *Ledyngton*, whose capacitie and creditt is worth six others, helpeth much in this, or els suerly I see folly wold hazard the whole.”

On the 27th, there appears to have been some difference of opinion between Sir William and his colleague, Dr. Wotton, upon one article, which rather retarded the conclusion of the Treaty; [see *Haynes*, 334.] and just afterwards an incident occurred, which gave the Secretary an opportunity of displaying his good policy; artful in its way, but he had a crooked people to deal with. The French at Leith had lost their Commander, M. de *Martigues*; but, "their hope of peace," says the Secretary, "keepeth the soldiers from tumult." Hopes of peace, on the part of the French soldiery, were good grounds for obtaining better terms from the French negotiators. He therefore caused it to be given out, that peace was not so near, in consequence of the refusal of the French Ministers to deliver to the Lord Grey fifty of their prime captains or officers. He caused papers to this effect to be shot into the Tower, and proposing to the garrison that such surrender should be made to the Duke of Norfolk, who was otherwise coming with sufficient force to subdue them. The English army, and Lords of the Congregation appear to have been equally revived and animated by this apparent rupture of the negotiation; but, in his letter to the Duke of Norfolk, Cecil plainly avows his purposes to have been, "only to abate the French Embassadors hopes of peace, and to reduce them to some better terms." [*Haynes*, 335.]

On the 1st of July, things seemed to be proceeding very untowardly from the report made to the Queen by Sir William and Dr. Wotton. The great difficulty was, to procure the French Court in any manner to recognise or acknowledge the treaty England had entered into with the confederate Lords. They were *subjects*, and in the eyes of the French Court, *rebels*. The difficulty was certainly no trifling one, and Sir William seems to have felt it in all its force, as may be seen by his letter of the 19th of June already mentioned; upon this point, the Treaty had nearly been brought to an abrupt end. The French negotiators offered to assent to so much of the agreement, or Treaty, as related merely to the weale of both the realms, and yet, after having made this offer, they flew from it again, as it appears from the following remark of the English Commissioners: "We have been content to admitt this, their own article, and yet they impudently deny it; the Bishop falsely excusing himself by Randall's (Randon's) denyall." This appears to have been a common trick with them. In this letter of the 1st of July, a very circumstantial and curious account is given of the several interviews and verbal communications that took place between the Ministers of the two Courts, but particularly be-

tween the Secretary and the Bishop of Valence; and at the end of the letter are to be found in Latin the articles discussed, with the result of such discussions, as affecting each of the articles severally. They are very curious: the last, marked G., is noted to have been “stiffly denied, until by threatening it was gotten;” and the account in the letter relating to this article, is as follows:

“To all other theyr scruples noted in our articles, we yelded and bent ourselves to their bowes, saving in one, wherein we obtayned with great difficultie to be confessed in wordes, *that the Realm of England and Irelande of right appertayned to your Majestie*—in which point I your Secretary was moved to excede some discretion, but not my duty, and offered in that quarrell to spend my blood upon any of them that would deny it, but yet without much vehemency and some threatening it was not obtayned.”

The article thus difficultly obtained was as follows: “Cum Regna *Angliæ* et *Hiberniæ* ad dictam Serenissimam Dominam et Principem *Elizabethem jure* spectant et pertineant, et proinde nulli alteri se dicere, scribere, nominare, seu intitulare, nec dici scribi, notificari, aut intitulari facere, regem aut reginam, *Angliæ* et *Hiberniæ*, neque insignibus et armis vulgaritur dictis (*Armoyries*) regnorum *Angliæ* aut *Hiberniæ* sibi arrogare, aut uti liceat: id circo statutum, pactum et conventum est, quod dictus Rex Christianiss. et Regina *Maria*, et uterque eorum abstinebunt, &c.—”

There was still, however, another point, more difficult, if possible, to be got over, namely, that of “mingling matters of *Scotland* with *England* in the Treaty;” that is, as it is farther explained, not to insert any thing derogatory from the honour and dignity of the French King, as though he were forced by the Queen of England to accept terms from his own subjects; but this also was got over by a special clause or article, drawn up, as it would seem, by Sir William, with his colleague’s consent. Being in Latin, and of some length, we shall merely observe upon the drift of the article, as bearing upon the case of the Confederates. It refers all motions on the part of the French King and Mary towards the Confederates to their own great *clemency* and *condescension*, upon the voluntary promises and professions of the latter to enter into all due obedience, and in consequence of the interposition of Elizabeth to bring about this good understanding between them.

These things being thus settled, on the 2d of July we find Sir William writing thus to Petre:



“Sir,—By our seconde lettre to the Quene’s Majestie you shall perceive that things have altered here with us as the tyde. And now we will so proceed to make an end, as there shall be no faults to be founde, but in those that made the faults at the firste.

“If we make Peace, gett me leave to make a long journey to the Court; for I covett to peruse all the frontyers, and so to *Carlisle*, and to come home by *Hull*, and stumbling upon *Burley*, I may chance to tarry there three or foure dayes.

“Yours assured,

W. CECILL.”

From many letters written from the Court to Sir William, at this time, we may discern the estimation in which he was held there.

“All your friends here are merry, and all things as you left it. We all desyer your sone retorne hither, where, I assure you, you shall be greatly welcome.” [From the Lord Admiral [Clynton] to Secretary *Cecill*.—Haynes, 344.]

“Her Majestie prayseth God for your helthe, and prayethe for the good continewance thereof, and hathe commandid so to write with her moste harty commendacions.”

“All my Lords (of the Council) commend them unto you, and pray for your helthe: and so do I and all your frends here.”—[Sir Thomas Parry to Secretary *Cecill*, from the Court.—Haynes, 344.]

We do not trust these compliments beyond their proper meaning; but they must be allowed to indicate a very considerable confidence in Sir William’s talents and exertions when absent, and no small want of them at Court during that absence.

On the 5th of July the Commissioners write thus to Sir William Petre:

“Sir,—Yt wear pitie to defraude you, being in expectation, consydering our varietie of proceeding. This day our matters standeth in these termes. The articles of our whole treaty be on both partes written on parchment, ready to be signed and sealed, and so should have bene this night, but that the treaty betwene the *French* and *Scots* could not be concluded, afore six of the clock this evening—as for our parte, although we speak on our own behalves, we think the same shall prove very honorable for the Queenes Majestie, profitable for her realme, and commodious for the liberty of *Scotland*, which the *Scotts* do so well perceave, as they doo acknowledge themselves perpetually bounde to the Quenes Majestie for this inestimable benefit. And so we wish

you better lodging than we have ourselves. From Edinboroughe, the 5th of July, 1560, at eight of the clock at night.

“Yours assuredly, fully tyred,  
“*W. Cecill, N. Wotton.*”

In Haynes' Collection follows a public paper, purporting to be, “*La maniere qui à esté adviseé pour la demolition de la ville du petit Lict, et pour le partement des gens de guerre, estans dans i' celle, hors le royaume d'Ecosse.*” The details are curious; all to the following effect:—“*Et à l'instant que l'une des dictes pieces d'artillerie sera osteé de dessus les ramparts de la dicte ville, sera aussi retireé une des pieces d'Angleterre; puis un autre de la dicte ville, et un d'Angleterre, &c.—*”

On the 6th of July, 1560, the two commissioners, Sir William *Cecill* and Dr. Wotton, sent to the Queen a sort of summary or result of their labours; after some notice of the difficulties with which they had had to contend, they observe:

“Nevertheless we have obteyned for [your Majestie's own causes an honorable end, compelling them to acknowledg your undoubted right, which they were very hardly brought to doo in open treaty.\* neither we think they wold thereto agree, but that we bare them in hand, that we wold not only breake uppon that pointe with all our harts, but also thereby the world shuld see manifestly their injuriouse purposes, which in words they had excused and covered.—As for the suerty and libertie of *Scotland*, we have been meanes to obtayne all thyngs requisite, so as the Nobilitie here acknolege the realme more bounden to your Majestie, than to their Sovereign. We have so tempered the matter, that the honor of the *French* Kyng and Queen is as much considered as may be, whereunto we were no small helpers, as we thynk the *French* Ambassadors will confess, yea and thank us more for the same, than their master's subjects.† This country shal be governed by a counsell of twelve, taken out of the twenty-four first to be named in Parlement by the three estates: and of the twelve, seven shal be named by the Quene, and five by the Lords of Parlement. All things past since Marche 1558 shal be forgotten, and by

\* Surely this is sufficient so prove how entirely the assumption of the arms and title so often insisted upon was intended to impugn Elizabeth's *right* to the Crown, whether as legitimate by birth, heir under Henry's will, or established on the throne by Parliament.

† This is a remarkable passage and deserves attention.

Parlement shal be confirmed—no Frenchman shal have any office in the realme. The Nobilitie wold, if it were not to suspiciouse, make an accord in Parlement, that whosoever shal take pension of *France* shal be accounted an enemy to their countree—this is their *present* humour, *but a potion of French crownes may chance alter this.*”

The sum of their proceedings is then brought together, exhibiting, to say the least, a very curious display of the Secretary's diplomatic talents, considering especially with whom he had to deal. And, as far as regards the security of England and Scotland, from the notorious designs of the Lorrain family, the delicacy preserved towards the King and Queen of France is very curious, and seems to have been almost entirely the act of Sir William himself.

“Amongst other things for their suerty (the Scots), we have compacted in your Majestie's treaty, first, that there shall no shipp come into *Scotland* with men of warr or munition: next, that the French King and Quene shall accomplish all his grants to the Scotts; which, if he shall doo, we see not but your Majesty shall have long quietness with *Scotland*. It hath been the difficulste matter almost in our treaty to obteyne a covenant from the *French* Kyng and Quene to your Majestie to performe his promises to his subjects, for therein, as they saye, their master's honour is more touched, than in any thyng that ever could chance to hym: for so the world shall saye, that he is forced by your Majesty thereto (as in truth he is), though it may not be sayd to *Frenchmen*: next, the *Scotts* shall thereby owe all the favour which they receive from their King and Queen to your Majesty, as in truth also they doo, though they may not say so to the *French*.—Many other thyngs be accorded to the *Scotts* which shall much touch the French in honour, and chiefly redound to the liberty of the countrey. Two thyngs have been to whott (too hot) for the French to meddle withall, and therefore they be passed over, and left as they found them. The first is the matter of Relligion,\* which is here as freely, and rather more earnestly,

\* This is certainly a very curious passage in the Secretary's letter, if all the circumstances be considered, but most particularly the characters of the Commissioners. Montluc, a French Catholic Bishop, but supposed greatly to favour the Protestants, or Calvinists, under the auspices of the celebrated Margaret of Navarre, accused by the Dean of his Cathedral of being even secretly married.—[See *Dict. Historique*, Art. 11. *Montluc*.] M. de Randan, belonging to the Guisian faction; Dr. Wotton, one of Queen Mary's Catholic Counsellors; and Cecil, a Protestant. Under these circumstances, it might be good policy in the latter, not to make any particular stipulations concerning Religion, having secured to the Lords of the Congregation a power of assembling in free Parliaments, and of which they afterwards took advantage, by abolishing, after the departure



as I the Secretary thynke, receaved than in *England*; a hard thing now to alter, as it is planted. The second is, the accord, betwixt your Majesty and *Scotland*, remayneth in the same state that it was, and being motioned by the *French* Ambassador to have it dissolved, the *Scotts* would not accord.

“These two things, we think, will much offend the *French*, and how they will hereafter stand we know not; but we be well contented to leave them as we found them: and yet, if the said treaty should not remayne in force, the special points tending to keep *Frenchmen* out of *Scotland*, and such lyke, be well and assuredly provided for. If we conclude the treaty this day we shall doo our endeavour to hasten the dissolving of the army. I the Secretary have had some care hereof, and have taken order both upon the sea and land for the furdurance hereof.—

of the French, the Popish, and establishing, as far as it could be done, the Protestant Religion. Compensation was provided for the Bishops and Abbots, by restoring to them their property, securing their persons, and not even wresting from them their right of sitting in Parliament.—[See *Cook*, vol. ii. 314, 15, &c.] As for the expression, “which is here as freely, and rather more earnestly receaved, as I the Secretary think, than in England,” and which has been much noticed, it is very intelligible to those who consider that his colleague, Dr. Wotton, was reputed a Catholic, and could not well, therefore, be expected to join in the observation, and that Cecil’s remark upon the greater *earnestness*, with which the Reformed Religion seemed to him to be received in Scotland, might only refer to the more rigorous discipline, and zeal bordering upon intemperance, which marked the character of Knox’s system and conduct, comparatively with the more liberal, and less violent measures and changes carrying on in his own country. In point of morality and gravity of conduct and character, it is certainly very probable, that the Northern Protestants surpassed those of the South, and so far might appear more earnest, but that the expression implied any decided preference of the Knoxian or Calvinistic system of belief or discipline, as approaching nearer to purity of Religion than the Reformation in England, is, we think, deducing more from the terms than they strictly warrant, though the Secretary had certainly a high opinion of the learning and of the zeal, when duly tempered, of many who had been exiles at Geneva, as we shall have occasion to shew. Knox, however, had in so rude and rough a manner abused the English Liturgy, in which Cecil is judged to have had no small hand, that it is scarcely possible to conceive that he could have regarded with any very favourable eye the (earnest, certainly, but in some respects too) rigid and severe principles of the Scottish Reformers. Ridley was amazed at Knox’s objections to the Liturgy, though he adds in the letter in which he complains of it to Grindal, “surely Mr. Knox is, in my mind, a man of much good learning and of earnest zeal.” It might be conjectured, without much want of charity, that the Article (Art. 5.) for the satisfaction and security of the Bishops and Abbots was suggested by Montluc, who is said to have had a son of his own, and might, therefore, feel the more for the dispossessed Scottish Dignitaries, *most of whom*, we are very gravely told, had also *families* to provide for.

“From the Campe before Leth, the 6th of July, 1560, your Majesty’s most humble and obedient subjects and servants, W. CECILL, N. WOTTON.”

In a letter of the same date to Sir William Petre, relative to a great practiser, George Paris, whom the Secretary describes as a man “entertayned in houshold with the old Queen, as an instrument to trouble Ireland,” but who was now offering his services to the Queen of England for the very contrary purposes. Sir William concludes his letter, “God send us now peace of mind, by unitie of good will, and *uniformyte in honouring of God.*”

The peace was proclaimed on the 7th of July. The Secretary writes to the Queen: “It seemeth suerly very welcom to all parts.” If the French had stood out longer at Leith, “it shuld,” he says, “have been the occasion of the shedding of a greate deal of blood, which is now well saved.”\* Then follows “the substance of the accord,” as he calls it, which we shall endeavour to abridge as well as we can, as it is necessary to shew what was the original wish and purpose of this great Minister with regard to the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and France, had they continued to stand in the same relative situation towards each other as at this time.

The treaty of *Casteau* in *Cambresey* reduced to its former strength. The French army to be withdrawn, excepting 120; to be stationed, sixty “in the Isle here,” and sixty in Dunbar, whose new fortification to be demolished, as well as the town of *Leith*.

All hostile preparations to cease, and no troops or “warly apparel” to be transported from England or Ireland to France, or from France to England, Scotland, or Ireland.

Aymouth to be more dismantled before the English army return to Berwick.

Her Majestie’s undoubted right to the Crown of *England* and *Ireland* is fully confessed and acknowledged, and no other person to use the arms, &c.; and any thing done to the contrary, in France or Scotland, to be redressed.

The demand of Calais and 500,000 crowns, referred to a new treaty, which if not concluded in three months, King Philip to settle it in a twelvemonth.†

\* “In this manner,” says the author of the Life of Knox, “terminated the civil war which attended the Scottish Reformation, after it had continued for twelve months, with less rancour and bloodshed than have distinguished any other contest of a similar kind.”—i. 321.

† This was probably, with much prudence, deferred, as we may judge from the following passage in a letter from the Duke of Norfolk to Sir William, after the return of the latter to the

“Next this,” as the letter states, “followeth the covenant to your Majestie, for observing the Treaty now accorded betwixt the *French* and the *Scotts*; which article was as hardly obtayned as any; and next to yt the recognition of your Majestie’s right to the Crowne.”

This deserves attention, as plainly evincing the evil disposition prevailing against the Queen at the Court of France.

This is the sum of the Treaty, as affecting England and France; next follows the agreement as respecting Scotland; the principal articles of which, as additional to the preceding Treaty respecting the removal of the French forces, consist in giving as much power as possible to the Parliamentary assembly of the three Estates, and to the exclusion of foreigners from the ordinary offices of the realm.

On the 15th of July, 1560, the Secretary, in an address to the Lords of the Council, uses the following odd, but probably true remark: “Here is good-will of all Pacts, the *French* to be gone, we to carry them, and the *Scotts* to curse them hence, so as by Wednesdaye at night, we men of Peace, trust to lodge at Haddington.”

Dr. Cook, in his History of the Reformation in Scotland, thus speaks of the Treaty as it regarded England, “The glory and security of Elizabeth were thus eminently promoted.—She procured by the Treaty the abjuration of claims, which, from the commencement of her reign, had been to her the source of much disquietude, which she knew were esteemed valid by a great part of her subjects, and which, at a future period, might have occasioned more trouble and hazard than could now ever arise from them, after having been solemnly renounced by the Princess, who alone would maintain them. She also delivered her kingdom from the imminent danger of invasion; with which, in every season of difficulty, it would have been assailed, had the French retained their footing in Scotland; while by her generous and magnanimous conduct to the

Court. “Nowe you are arrived att the Court I dowght not but that you shall find alteration of your last letter unto me. Blind men can schewes (discern) no colours; perchans they that make most of their payntyd schathe, wyll never doo such sarvys unto this realme, as you have done in concludyng thys Peace. I dare in argument stand with them all, that the Quene’s Majesty could could not have bought this agreement too dearly. Perchans sum will saye, with diffaryng we might have had *Calys*: but I will rather thynke, that we might have spede lyke the Dog in *Æsop’s Fables*, whiche having a bone in his mouth and seying the shadow thereof in the water, gaped to have fetchet it, and so lost bothe.”—*Haynes*, 360.



Scottish Lords, she gained their affections, and rendered them partial to an alliance with England; thus establishing over their minds, and, through them, over the Government of Scotland, a more powerful influence than had been at any time possessed by its own Sovereign.”—Vol. ii. 305. Speaking generally of the Treaty, as regarding Scotland, he says, “The principal articles of the Treaty evince the anxiety with which Elizabeth had watched over the interests of the Lords; the care with which she had provided against their being harassed for their preceding conduct, and the wisdom with which she secured the future independence of their country.”\*

This is indeed confirmed by the twelve articles of the Treaty which follow, and which amply provide for the due administration of the Government by the Queen and three estates, all foreign armies being withdrawn. There is a great display of loyalty, but with due regard to the rights of the people, and security of the Protestant Church of Scotland. It was after the conclusion of this Peace, and upon the subsequent meeting of Parliament in August, that the Earls of Morton and Glencairn, with Maitland of Lethington, were deputed to England, to thank Elizabeth, and request that she would consent to unite herself in marriage with the Earl of Arran, heir presumptive to the throne, on the demise of Mary, without children. And as the Parliamentary order was subscribed by the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, four bishops, and several of the Popish clergy, it has been reasonably regarded, not as designed to supplant Mary, but to do all they could to establish a firm alliance with England. Elizabeth declined the match, but in terms very complimentary to Arran, and the Scotch nation at large.

The Treaty of Edinburgh, together with the proceedings of the subsequent Parliament, held in virtue of that Treaty, and in which the Protestant Confession of Faith received a sanction, and the rites of the Popish religion were abolished by a national assembly, the largest in point of numbers ever known; consisting of the Nobility, Barons, and Commissioners of Boroughs; may be regarded as a decided triumph on the part of the Protestants. The Treaty itself being, as a learned writer justly calls it, the Charter of their Liberty. Still, we must confess, the proceedings were very hasty with regard to *Mary*, whose ratification of the Treaty was wanting, and whose prerogative, notwithstanding all the professions of loyalty in the public instruments, was nearly reduced to nothing.

\* See the Edinburgh Review, of McCrie's Life of Knox, No. XXXIX. pp. 16, 17.

Those who objected to the validity of this Parliament, as legally or constitutionally assembled, had much reason on their side, and it would seem, that the only excuse to be made was, that the emergency was a very extraordinary one, and the times revolutionary; and the Queen abiding in a foreign country, under foreign influence, notoriously inimical to the liberties of Scotland, civil and religious. As to the *forgery*\* of which Lethington and Cecil stand accused by Chalmers, in regard to the Scotch accord, it is a controversy depending so much on negative and circumstantial evidence, that we cannot pretend to enter into it, further than to say, that Cecil, in his letters, seems to shew, that it was all negotiated between him and the French Commissioners, without the assistance of Lethington, or others of the Nobility.—See *Chalmers*, vol. i. 34. vol. ii. 414.

From the following note of Lord Burghley's, we find that he returned to Greenwich on the 28th of July, having been gratefully and honourably escorted to Berwick, together with his colleague, Dr. Wotton, by many of the Lords of the Congregation, a circumstance he passes over. "July 28. Sir William Cecill came to Greenwich from Scotland, so as he was absent sixty-three dayes, having had 4*l.* per diem, in toto 252*l.* and for postage with twenty-two horses from London to Edinburghe, and from thence back to London, 117*l.*"

That Sir William performed these services with no very prudent regard to his own pocket, we may conclude from the following passage, in a letter addressed to him by the Lord Treasurer Winchester, after his return to Court, August 24, 1560. "In the mean tyme all good Councillors shall have labor and dolor without reward; whereyn your part is most of all mens; for your charge and paynes be farre above all oder mens, and your thanks and rewards least, and worse considered; and specially, for that you spend holy of your self, without your ordinary fee, land, patent, gift, or ony thing: which must nedes discomfort you. And yett when your Counsell is most for her Majesties honor and proffit, the same hath got hinderaunce by her weke credit of you, and by

\* So Chalmers calls it; one of his proofs is, that when Dr. Wotton died, in 1566, Cecil was restless till he obtained possession of the papers of his coadjutor, in order to see what account Dr. Wotton had given of the supposititious accord with the Scotch nobles; and he refers to Strype's Annals, iii. 208. (301. Oxford Edition), but Strype's account is very different. I think, in fact, the honour of the French King and Queen, as far as it was considered, was the work of *Cecil*, against the will of the Nobility.—See before p. 45.

back counsell; and so long as that manner shall contynue, it must needs be dangerous servie and unthankfull."

This passage alone may serve to shew, how little responsible Sir William was for *all* the measures of Elizabeth—how much he was liable to be thwarted by "back counsell," and a temporary or casual want of confidence on the part of the Queen.

We are the more disposed to notice this, in consequence of two letters, which, in Haynes's Collection, immediately follow that of the Lord Treasurer. The first is from Lord Robert Dudley (the famous Earl of Leicester) to Sir William Cecil; the second from Mr. Lever from Coventry, to the two Secretaries of State, Sir Francis Knollys and Sir William Cecil, communicating the suspicions and rumours afloat, "of the death of her, which was the wife of my Lord Robert Dudley."\*

\* It was in the course of this year, that an occurrence took place, to which every body's attention was, not long ago, forcibly attracted, by its being made the subject of one of those extraordinary novels which, partaking almost equally of history and fiction, have, with a rapidity the most surprising, filled the shelves of almost every private gentleman's library, and are never likely to be allowed hereafter to pass into oblivion; it is sufficient to mention the name of Sir Walter Scott. Those who are well read in the pages of Kenilworth, will conclude that we refer to the tragical death of the wife of Leicester, at Cumner, in Berkshire, the particulars of which will, in all likelihood, never now be better known upon earth, than as they are hinted at, in that interesting performance; and of which it is as much as we can be expected to say, in such a work as the present, it *may all be true*. For a letter is certainly extant, written by a grave and reverend person, to Sir Francis Knollys and Sir William Cecil, as joint Secretaries of State, mentioning the foul rumours that were afloat upon the subject; and rather urging an inquiry. It is to be found in Haynes's Selection of the Burghley Papers. It would be certainly desirable, to ascertain what steps were taken in consequence of such a letter, but here we are in the dark. Probably, direct evidence of violence, on the parts of Foster and Varney, could not be produced; and without the means of invalidating their testimony, as to the accidental death of the Countess, it might have been useless and very unsatisfactory to proceed; but since Sir William Cecil's name appears to be implicated in it, it may behove us to state our sentiments; and to say, that, in all probability, he believed the story of her untimely end, or at least, so far supposed it might be true, as to regard it as a stigma, unremoved, bearing hard upon the character and credit of his great rival; for he enumerates it among the objections to the Queen's making him her husband, that "he stood infamed by the death of his wife." In the Burghley Papers, there is, it must be confessed, immediately before the letter of Lever, and apparently placed so as to seem to intervene somewhere between the 24th of August and 17th of September, a letter to Cecil, from the Lord Robert Dudley, betokening no small agitation of mind, and an allusion to some charges against him, which very possibly refer to the very case in question; it is as follows: without date—



Leicester's own letter is, as far as possible, unintelligible; probably so written on purpose. The second letter urges inquiry. It is probable, that upon this occasion, "back counsellors" interposed, to save the delinquent. The real story still remains unexplored, though if the walls of *Cumner* could speak, there may, almost now, be enough remaining of them, to bear testimony to the real circumstances of the catastrophe, which is likely to give importance to the spot, to the end of time. It would, however, seem that something passed at this time, implicating both Leicester and the Queen, though for want of dates, it is not easy to connect it with the letter. We refer to the Declaration, Confession, and Submission of Arthur Gunter, to be seen in *Haynes*, 364, 365.

In the course of this year, considerable progress was made in the advancement of Protestantism, or restoration of the Church to the state it was in at the demise of Edward; the new Bishops were all men of distinguished learning; and, as such, were wisely called upon, in the season of Lent, to preach the sermons at Paul's Cross, as well as at Court, "who did commonly," as Strype says, "make it their business in their sermons, to prove and evince the present proceedings in Religion; and, as occasion served, to lay open the errors and corruptions of that religion and worship, that was now lately rejected." And of the effect of these sermons, he observes, that being "so well and learnedly performed, at which assembled such vast confluences of auditors, countenanced

"To myne assured Sir William Cecill, Knight,

"Princypall Secretary to her Majesty.

"Sir,—I thank you much for your being hear: and the great frendshipp you have shewyd towards me, I shall not forgett. I am veary loth to wysh you hear again, but I wodd be very gladd to be with you thear. I pray you lett me hear from you, what you think best for me to doe, if you dowbt, I pray you ask the questyon, for the soner you can advyse me thether, the more I shall thank you. I am sorry so sodden a chaunce shuld brede me so great a chandge, for methinks I am hear all this while, as it were in a Dreame, and to farr, to farre, from the place, I am bound to be; whear, mythinkes, also, this long idle Tyme, can not excuse me, for the Dewty I have to discharge ellswheare. I pray you help him who seues to be at Liberty, owt of so great Bondage. Forgett me not, though you see me not, and I will remember you, and fayll ye not, and so wysh you well to doe. In hast this Morning. I beseech you Sir forgett not to offer up the humble Sacrafyce you promysed me.

"Your veary assured,

"R. DUDLEY."

It is difficult to say what this letter can mean; it is without date, as was before intimated, but immediately preceding the letter of Lever, in *Haynes's Collection*, 361, 2.—See on this, *Lingard*, 194, 195, 199.

also by the presence of the Queen and Nobility, reconciled great respect to the new religion (as it was called); and the persons of this clergy, newly appearing out of their banishments and recesses, shining with clear consciences, and holy zeal for the truth and Gospel." In one of these sermons Jewel, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, staked the whole credit of his theological learning, on the most positive assertions, that no authority was to be found in the Holy Scriptures, in the Fathers, or in the decrees of ancient Councils, for some of the leading tenets, and most imposing practices of the Romish Church;\* such as private masses; communion in one kind only; prayers in an unknown tongue; transubstantiation, and the pretended universal authority of the Bishop of Rome. He was answered in letters by Dr. Cole, and Jewel published a reply; the first were circulated only among the Doctor's own party; the latter appeared openly, and in print. Others engaged in the dispute, as may be seen in Strype's Annals of the Reformation; and indeed it was prolonged much beyond the period of which we are writing, being principally the happy occasion, as we may conclude, of the admirable *Apology* for the Church of England, by the learned Bishop, of which we shall have more to say hereafter.

It was natural to think, that so many Bishops could not be deprived, as turned out to be the case, and others in so short a time elected, confirmed, and consecrated, without raising questions as to the validity of the several forms

\* Among the practices now judged to be almost peculiar to the Church of Rome, we may reckon their weekly fasts, or abstinence from meats, and their strict observance, particularly in this respect, of the season of Lent; but at the period of the Reformation, this does not seem to have been regarded as any corruption of religion, or one at all deserving to be formally abrogated or done away; and indeed, if kept clear from superstition, and considered as an act of voluntary self-denial and humiliation, no serious Christian would venture to dispute its propriety; as it is clear from Lord Burghley's Household-book, under the last reign, that a fish-diet was regularly provided for Fridays and Saturdays, (vol. i. 688.) which has been regarded by some, as one proof of his conformity. It may be well to shew, that the Lent Season was strictly, though not superstitiously observed, after Elizabeth's accession, a letter being extant from the Secretary himself to Archbishop Parker, to procure a dispensation for the son of Lord North, in which he states, "That the bearer, Sir Roger North, son and heir to the Lord North, being to him (the Secretary) well known, had, in consideration of his ill estate of health, and the danger that might follow, if he should be restrained to eating of fish, prayed him to be means to his Grace to dispense with him herein; he doubted not but his Grace should of all others understand, how requisite it was for the preservation of his health, that he should be dispensed withal." The butchers, indeed, by proclamation, were forbidden to kill meat in Lent, under a heavy penalty.—See more upon this hereafter.

used, in an emergency of such a nature. We should be going much out of our way, to enter far into this part of the history of the Reformed Church; but as it appears to have occasioned some difficulty to the Secretary as well as the new Archbishop; and many strange stories were afterward broached by the Papists, beginning with the famous charge against the Archbishop himself, of having received his consecration at a common Inn or Tavern, and from the hands of such as were no Catholic Bishops; we must refer our readers, for a true account of all these transactions, to the Life of that great Prelate by Strype, b. ii. ch. 1. only observing, that it was a great object with the opposers of the Reformation, to invalidate the consecration of the Metropolitan, that thereby his subsequent consecration of other Bishops, might appear to be invalid also. The motive being thus sifted and understood, may well account for the strange "fable," as it has been justly called, of the "*Nag's head*," the sign of the Inn where the new Protestant Bishops were said to have gone through the farce of a mutual, informal, and in fact, illegal consecration, the one of the other. Many new Bishops being, however, appointed, the Primate lost no time in endeavouring to provide for the due supply of void churches, by the nomination and appointment of proper ministers. The first care seems to have been, to remove *improper* ministers; particularly as I find it expressed, "the old oft-revolted priests, that complied under all the late revolutions of religion;"\* we have already shewn, from Camden, that many Popish priests took the oath of supremacy, in order that by retaining their benefices, they might *exclude the Protestants*. These, therefore, were in all reason judged fit to be deposed. The next care, of course, was to place the ministry itself generally upon a more respectable footing; for which end, the Archbishop himself drew up a writing, entitled, "*An Order for serving the Cures now destitute*," in which, to shew the attention paid by the Secretary to all matters of public importance, whether

\* This was more fully expressed, in the Article relating to them, in a paper purporting to be Orders for the Clergy, and regulation of the Church.

"That all priests made to say Mass afore it was abolished in King Edward's days, which then first had said Mass; and secondarily after it was then abolished, renouncing the Mass and Papistry, did profess and practice the Christian ministry; and thirdly, in Queen Mary's time revolted again unto Papistry; and fourthly, now in Queen Elizabeth's time, be returned again into the ministry; that therefore now they cease from any ministry of the word and sacraments, until further examination and order be taken, with them and others, according to God's word." This Article is besides much enlarged upon by entering further into particulars, in the paragraph immediately following.



relating to the Church or the State, one rule or order is said to have been specially introduced, or added by *Cecil*, contrary to the opinion of Bishop Grindal; the purport of the rule was as follows: "The said principal incumbent, or pastor in course, to resort in circuit to every his peculiars, as well to preach the word, and to minister the holy communion, as to marry, and baptize the children born since his last being there; and the people to be taught by an homily, that they need not scruple for the delay of baptism, if the children departed before they be presented to the minister: considering, that in the primitive Church, the fathers used but two principal feasts, Easter and Pentecost, to admit children to the holy Font." The force of Grindal's objection seems to have been, that it might tend to revive one of the quarrels in the Cornish rebellion, under King Edward: *viz.*, "that their children died without baptism."

No man, one would think, could better remember the Cornish rebellion under Edward, than Cecil; and it might more reasonably be supposed, that he wanted such an Homily to be prepared, as might prevent, rather than excite, similar quarrels or complaints; and to shew that his object was to pacify the feelings, and quiet the fears of the people, and yet provide for all their *reasonable* anxieties, it was added, "yet the minister or pastor was not forbid, if he might conveniently, to minister the sacrament of baptism on a week-day, being required thereunto, and that without pact or covenant of reward, but of charity and zeal; which he ought to bear to the reasonable request of his people: and they of their charitable consideration, in respect of time, weather, or distance of place, not to molest the said pastor more than need."

There seems then to be not only much good sense shewn in this Article, but for the times, a more correct judgment upon the point expressed, than could reasonably have been expected; in the disputes upon the subject of the baptism of infants in old time, particularly among the Pelagians and Augustinians, the former, by their denial of original sin, having greatly depreciated the value and importance of Christian baptism; the latter had been drawn so far into the contest as to maintain, that infants born in original sin, as all infants were, would infallibly incur the punishment and damnation of the wicked, if not baptized; the horror of this alternative had induced some to invent a middle state for unbaptized infants, where, in losing heaven they might yet escape the torments of hell. Still the other opinion prevailing generally in the Latin Church, led to the error, in order to quiet the fears of alarmed and anxious

parents, of admitting lay persons to administer the sacrament of baptism; which actually continued, according to the rubric, an error of our own Church, till the year 1575,\* when Grindal himself being Archbishop, a decree was made that in cases even of private baptism, however urgent the occasion, the ceremony must be performed by a lawfully ordained minister. The Article therefore introduced by Cecil fifteen years previous to the decree of Convocation, though objected to by Grindal at the time, seems exactly consonant to the proper bearings of the case: it implies the necessity for an ordained minister, but as such may not always be at hand, it holds out comfort to every anxious parent not to despair of God's mercy towards the infant, should the rite by inevitable necessity be unperformed at the time of the child's death; it affords every reasonable opportunity for calling in a minister, in any urgent case, but not to the indulgence of any unreasonable or superstitious apprehensions, that might subject the minister called upon to any extraordinary difficulties or inconveniences, by an evident want of time, stress of weather, or distance of place; circumstances not likely to be duly considered by persons in a state of desperate alarm, though full of hazard, perhaps, to any minister exposed to such hindrances or obstructions; and herein it may be farther remarked, the Secretary opposes Knox, who it seems, from a correspondence between Ridley and Grindal in Mary's reign, objected to *private* baptism under any circumstances. "What would he," says Ridley, "in that case should be done? peradventure he will say, it is better than to let them die without baptism."—*Strype's Grindal*, 28, 29. The case in point, is one, as applicable to the present state of the Church, as it could be in the days of Elizabeth. The Secretary ought therefore to have his due share of praise, for so wholesome an ecclesiastical regulation, notwithstanding Bishop Grindal, his great friend's "*non probo*," to be seen to this day; but which Grindal himself, by his actions, seems afterwards to have retracted; for by restraining lay persons from performing the ceremony (1575), and ministers not being always within call, *in periculo mortis*, parents and others must be sometimes obliged, and therefore should always stand prepared to leave their children, dying unbaptized through inevitable necessity, *to the mercies of God*.

In the course of this year the following extraordinary proposals are said to have been sent to the Queen from Pope Pius IV., through his nuncio, Vincentio

\* "Item, That private baptism in necessity, as in peril of death, be administered either by the curate, deacon, or reader, or some other grave and sober man, if the time will suffer."—*Interpretation of the Queen's Injunctions*, 1560.

Parpalio, to confirm the English Liturgy, allow the partaking of the Sacrament in both kinds, and disannul the sentence against her mother's marriage, if she would, on the part of her subjects as well as herself, acknowledge the authority of the Roman see; but the Queen would not allow this nuncio, Parpalio, to come into her dominions, nor yet a second, the Abbot Martinegues,\* who was supported and encouraged by the King of France and some of her allies; nor would she at all comply with their united request to her to send a minister to the council of Trent.† The Pope, failing in all these points,‡ sent Friars and Jesuits to sow dissension in England, armed with dispensations for every character they might find it necessary to *assume*, or every doctrine they might *profess*, however adverse to the church of Rome. The council of Trent even sent directions to them to sow divisions wherever they could; where Lutheranism should be found to prevail, to preach Calvinism; where Calvinism, Lutheranism, or any other doctrine, not omitting even the wild tenets of the Anabaptists, sooner than not do all that could be done to confound the Protestants.§ A communication it seems, at this time, was supposed to be going forward between Calvin and the new Archbishop,|| for a straiter union among the

\* “Martinengo, a Nuncio of the Pope's, came to Brussels, requesting liberty to come into the realm, but it was denied.”—*Lord Burghley's Notes*, May 1561. See also *Collier*, ii. 474.

† Pius IV., like all other Popes, was averse from calling any more general councils, but was compelled at last, in order to prevent a more mortifying expedient, threatened by France in particular, namely, that of summoning *national* councils. The Protestants of France were desirous of having such a council, in which they were encouraged and aided by the celebrated Montluc, Bishop of Valence, of whom we have already had so much to say. This led to the re-opening (for so it seemed to be) of the council of Trent, fixed for Easter-day, 1561, and at which all the Protestant as well as Catholic Princes and towns in Europe were invited to assist. This the former generally refused, while Elizabeth's example, of not even admitting the Nuncio to enter her kingdom, was followed by the King of Denmark.

‡ Among the Cottonian MSS., Titus, C. 10, the following memorandum occurs in a journal of the year 1560:—“*Papa petit consensum Hispani ut Reginam excommunicaret.*”

§ Strype's *Life of Parker*, i. 341. *Annals*, i. 141.

|| Calvin had, in truth, written to the Primate, strongly urging a stricter union among Protestants, rejoicing in the accession of Elizabeth, a princess likely to be instrumental in propagating the true faith of Jesus Christ, by restoring the Gospel, and expelling idolatry, with the Bishop of Rome's usurped power, and recommending it to him to advise her Majesty to summon a general assembly of all the Protestant clergy, and that a set form and method of public service and church government might be agreed upon and established. This letter was laid before the Queen and Council by the Archbishop, and his Grace was desired to thank Calvin for it, and to express a general approbation of his proposals, only observing to him, that as to church govern-



Reformed, which gave no small alarm to the Pope and to his whole college of Cardinals.

In this year died the great Reformer, Melancthon, in his sixty-third year, and was buried at Wittemberg; his epitaph may be seen in Strype. No man had been more solicited to come into England, in the reigns of Henry and Edward, as we have shewn in our first volume; his learning and moderation have secured to him, in all times, the respect, not of friends only, but of adversaries; and though, upon some points, he is supposed to have yielded too much in the course of the great struggle on foot, there is every reason to attribute it more to the extreme amiableness of his disposition than any servile timidity or want of zeal.

The Queen this year received a visit from the brother of the King of Sweden, sent to solicit the hand of her Majesty for the Swedish monarch; though not a successful suitor, he was received and entertained with all due distinction.

ment, they had resolved to *retain* episcopacy, not on the model of the church of Rome, or with the Romish ceremonies, but according to the primitive and purer times. Before the proposals of Calvin, however, could be farther acted upon, that eminent Reformer died; but there are proofs enough extant, that such an episcopacy as the English church had in view, would not have been objectionable to the heads of the Helvetian church at this time. Melancthon, it may be added, who died this year, was, by his own acknowledgment, so friendly to episcopacy, as to be known to have declared, that if the German Bishops would but have received the Augustan Confession, and allowed the pure doctrine of the Gospel to be publicly taught, their power and the administration of their dioceses should have been continued, in which Luther also is said to have agreed.—See *Strype's Annals*, vol. i. 352, and his *Life of Parker*, b. ii. c. 2, 1560, where may be seen a curious account of some former proposals of Calvin having been intercepted and suppressed by Gardiner and Boner, though not discovered till about the sixth year of Elizabeth's reign, when the Queen herself expressed her concern that the discovery had not taken place sooner, before her council; and, as it is added, "in the presence of her great friends, Sir Henry Sidney and SIR WILLIAM CECIL."

## CHAP. III.

1561.

Third year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, began November 17, 1560.

*Death of Francis II., King of France—Perplexities of Elizabeth's title and competition with Mary of Scotland—Lord Burghley accused of deliberate enmity to Mary—His letter to Lord Shrewsbury—Elizabeth's title denied in France—Mary's principles and connexions alarming to the Protestants—Her intention to return to Scotland—Randolph sent to Scotland—Reflections and remarks on his Instructions—Missions of Murray and Leslie to France—Mary's passport refused—Scheme in France to detain Murray—Murray reported to have designs on the Crown—Throckmorton's account of Randon—Why Arran thought of by England—Possible causes for Mary's interception, if true—Her arrival in Scotland—Advantages over Elizabeth—Employs the Protestants on her return—Intercourse with Elizabeth—Desires to be acknowledged heir to Elizabeth—Refuses to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh—Cheney, a worthy but odd man, assisted by Cecil—The Queen visits the Secretary—The walking at Paul's stayed by Proclamation—Cecil made Master of the Court of Wards.*

THE following is the first entry in Lord Burghley's notes, at the commencement of the *third* year of the Queen's reign.

"Dec. 5, 1560. Francis, the French King, husband to the Scots' Queen, died of a fever, who reigned but one year. Carolus IX. succeeded him, who reigned fourteen years."

Though we have already shewn, by many instances, in how irritating and insolent a manner the French Court, through the influence of the House of Lorrain, had, from the first moment of the Queen's accession, advanced the claims of Mary of Scots to the English throne, and sought to further those claims, by subjecting Scotland to its power; threatening thereby, not only the Reformed party, which had at that time become considerable, but the civil rights and liberties of that devoted country, with the expectations of the next heir; yet it cannot be doubted, that nothing could more fatally conspire to aggravate all the threatened evils, than the untimely death of Francis II., the husband of Mary Queen of Scots, unless, which was scarcely to be expected, the latter might be brought to sanction and confirm all that had just been effected, to

secure the liberty of Scotland, the Protestant Religion, and amity with England, as the consequence of both. If this might be looked to, it was to be regarded as rather a fortunate event to Scotland, and especially to the ‘Congregationists,’ by lessening the power of the Princes of Lorrain; but as things turned out, it may rather be regarded as the beginning of all the troubles to which Mary was doomed, for the remainder of her short but most wearisome life, and, for the same period, the source of constant uneasiness to Elizabeth, and of embarrassment to her Counsellors.

It is impossible then to enter upon this portion of the Life of Lord Burghley (then Mr. Secretary Cecil), without reflecting on the hazard every historian runs, even to this day, of taking a view of things, which others will conceive to be founded on misrepresentation, if not on the grossest partiality; a partiality, besides, likely to offend the moral feelings and sensibilities of mankind, as bearing hard upon a *persecuted* Princess (for so Mary will always be thought) and an highly accomplished *female*. The world will perhaps never be entirely satisfied with regard to the conduct and character of these two extraordinary women and rival sovereigns; and surely it must be granted, that no two human beings were ever thrown, by circumstances, into a more perplexing state of opposition to each other, both personal and political. Mary’s title to the crown of England, to many, appeared much clearer, as a claim of inheritance, than Elizabeth’s. Every advantage, therefore, that the former possessed above the latter, must not only have been an object of female jealousy and envy, but of political alarm. Even her personal attractions, and comparative youth, might obtain for *Mary*, friends and supporters, which her rival might fail to conciliate; while Elizabeth had the mortification of constantly feeling, that with abundance of regal qualities of the first stamp, and some personal accomplishments, of which she was judged to be but too vain,\* she might occasionally sink upon comparison. The difference of religion alone must, to *both*, have been a continual source of distrust and suspicion, pointing at all times to a division in their respective kingdoms, which could not fail to give some advantage to each, in the countries

\* If the accounts given of her, by those who knew her well in her *earliest* years, be true, it would be difficult to say, at what period this personal vanity first began to display itself. The reader may consult the evidences adduced by Mr. Turner, in his recent history, of her great simplicity and moderation in dress, during the reigns of her father and brother; and till, indeed, she was *forced*, as it were, to follow the more showy example of her sister Mary.—See *Modern Hist. of England*, Part II. book ii. ch. xvii.



where they naturally bore no rule; and, in either case, the friends of the one could not but be regarded as, comparatively, the enemies of the other. Mary's Catholic friends in England, for instance, the enemies of Elizabeth, and Elizabeth's Protestant friends in Scotland, the enemies of Mary. While each might be expected to be continually endeavouring to gain adherents in the kingdom of the other,\* not, indeed, by open dealing always, but more frequently perhaps by secret and hidden interposition, for that was indisputably the character of the age; so much, and so generally, that perhaps it might almost be regarded as an established maxim of the leading states of Europe, during the whole of the *sixteenth* century, that without some covert intrigue, to *counteract* or *frustrate* the hidden stratagems of *others*, there could be no hopes of safety.

Writers have dwelt largely on the *personal* rivalry of these two exalted females; a competition which, as we have shewn, in a great variety of instances, could not fail to give the advantage to Mary; while, in the political rivalry, there might certainly at all times be found much to extenuate the faults of Elizabeth.

In confining our views chiefly to the part which Lord Burghley had to sustain in this complicated tragedy (for a tragedy it surely was from the beginning to the end), it will be manifestly our business to dwell much more upon the circumstances of their *political*, than of their *personal*, rivalry;† a topic less interesting perhaps to the generality of readers, but certainly far more important, as affording us the best clue to arrive at the real truth of things. For the more the question can be reduced to a mere question of politics, the more insignificant will their personal rivalry appear; and it must be granted, at all events, that they were BOTH great dissemblers. It was *impossible* they could *love each*

\* "The Protestant party of Scotland," says Miss Aikin, "was powerfully protected by Elizabeth; the Catholic party in England was secretly incited by Mary: and it became scarcely less the care and occupation of each to disturb the administration of her rival, than to fix her own on a solid basis."—i. 337. We must, however, observe, that the disturbance on Elizabeth's side was in favour of the liberties of mankind; while Mary's was to the continuance of their thralldom and subjugation, by the Popish hierarchy.

† "I am persuaded," says Dr. McCrie, in his *Life of Knox*, speaking of Elizabeth, "that she was always more jealous of Mary as a competitor for the crown, than as a rival in personal charms." Vol. i. 288, second edition. "We must not wonder," says *Rapin*, "that Elizabeth had always an eye upon the Queen of Scots as upon a very dangerous rival."—See in the original the occasion of this remark.

*other*, or be to each other the “*dear sisters*” they continually and *mutually* professed to be.\*

Knowing the *catastrophe* of this sad rivalry, (and who is there so ignorant as not to know it, with all its dismal circumstances ?) it is natural enough to conclude, that the life and crown of the Scottish Queen were much more in the power of Elizabeth, than the life and crown of Elizabeth in the power of Mary ; but to judge fairly of the competition, as a point of history, it is we think almost capable of proof, that had Elizabeth been, for ever so short a period, left exposed by her Ministers to the malice, resentment, and powerful exertions of Mary’s *friends* and *adherents*, the life and crown of the *English* Sovereign would have been in much the greatest jeopardy of the two ; and that nothing could have preserved the latter from the machinations and artful designs of Mary’s supporters, but the determined loyalty and fidelity of a large majority of her own subjects, and a vigilance on the part of her Ministers, the most unremitted and unwearied that could be conceived.

In the judgment to be formed of this most singular period of history, it has

\* The following extract from Southey’s *Book of the Church*, a passage *strangely* misrepresented by Dr. Milner, expresses exactly what we ourselves conceive to be a most just view of the *very peculiar circumstances* in which these two sovereigns were placed :—

“Two persons so circumstanced with regard to each other as the Queens of England and Scotland, must have been mortal enemies, unless they had been women of saintly piety and virtue. Both were endowed with extraordinary talents ; and in the natural dispositions of both, it is probable that the better qualities greatly preponderated. But they were so situated, that it was scarcely possible for them to think, or act, justly towards each other.”—Vol. ii. 274. They were always each others “*dear sisters*” in the whole course of their correspondence. Mary paid many fulsome compliments to Elizabeth, in which it is utterly impossible she should have been sincere. But royal letters are, we are sorry to say, the greatest burlesque possible upon the moral dealings of mankind. Henry II. of France, who permitted his son, the Dauphin, and Mary Queen of Scots, to assume the English titles and arms, in direct defiance of Elizabeth’s claims to the throne, and who supplicated the Pope to declare Mary to be Queen of England to the dispossession of Elizabeth, could have the duplicity to say and profess to the latter, through Calvacanti, on her accession to the Crown, “*Ayant perpetuellement désiré de veoir la dicte Dame parvenue au lieu et grandeur ou il la veoyt aujourd’huy constituée.*”—We must not look for true history in such records ; we must dive deeper. Miss Aikin, in her *Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth*, has very justly observed, “Neither of the Queens was a novice in the art of dissimulation, and as often as it suited the interest or caprice of the moment, each would lavish upon the other, without scruple, every demonstration of amity, every pledge of affection ; but jealousy, suspicion, and hatred dwelt irremoveably in the inmost recesses of their hearts.”

certainly been the too common practice to fix the whole attention on those circumstances of the case, which are more likely to be *felt* than *considered*; and which so naturally and immediately excite commiseration for the one party, as to involve the other in unqualified contempt and abhorrence. It is not going beyond the truth perhaps to assert, that every body is *prepared* to *hate* Elizabeth before he enters far into the history (even the most unprejudiced) of *Mary Queen of Scots*!

And yet, it cannot be denied, that *both* Queens had their faults—probably great faults—such faults indeed as no difference of times, or alteration of manners, can wholly excuse; for who can change the nature of malice, envy, jealousy, vanity, pride, hypocrisy, profligacy, or incontinency? And it remains a question to this day, as almost every body must know, How far such great faults and defects were justly attributable or not to these very celebrated personages? It was a saying of *Mary of Scots* herself, “The best of women are but women at the best.”

True it is, that though these great failings and weaknesses cannot be *essentially* different at different times, yet the general demoralization of any particular period must, in some degree, be allowed to extenuate the faults of individuals.\* It was undoubtedly an age of relaxed morals; of dissimulation and perfidy exceeding all belief; and it would be almost absurd to expect that what were the common vices of the times, should not find a readier admission into the breasts of Princes in those days, than at any more advanced period of civilization, refinement of manners, and heart-controlling religious principles.

This is not said in excuse of either of the Sovereigns, but to shew, that the struggle of politics was heightened, to those who had any thing to do with the affairs of state, by all that could be added to their complexity, through the prevalence of such vices, and that these really were times, in which, with a view to the security of opposite parties, there was scarcely a possibility of acting safely, within the strict lines of probity and fair dealing. Nor should it be forgotten, that there was *another Queen* in existence all the while, in whom (if all that has been very credibly related of her be strictly true) might be found, not one or two only of the faults and blemishes, severally attributed to *Mary*

\* “There is nothing so certain, as that morality varies with times and places; and that to censure conduct without reference to the age and nation of the individual, is substantial injustice.”  
—*Book of the Boudoir*, by Lady Morgan, 1829.



and Elizabeth, but perhaps all that ever were attributed to either of them. See as to *Catherine de Medicis*, *Bayle*, and various other writers.

It has been an imputation cast on Lord Burghley, and too easily credited, that he acted hostilely towards Mary, even from her very birth ; so as to betray occasionally that want of feeling, which, considering her great misfortunes and distresses, would have done dishonour to the qualities of his heart ; and which would by no means accord with the accounts given of his private character by those who knew him well. Sometimes, however, in the course of Mary's long captivity, he was on the contrary suspected, and even by Elizabeth herself, of too fondly espousing the interests of the Scottish Queen. It is but a fair presumption therefore to entertain, at the very outset of this melancholy story, that he sought to deal as equally as he could between them, and that his own memorable answer to the remark of Mary herself, during her trial, conveyed the exact sum of his hostility towards her : " You are my professed enemy," said the unhappy Queen. " Rather," replied Burghley, " the enemy of all who would destroy the Queen my Sovereign."\*

Having thus endeavoured to place this extraordinary competition of the two Sovereigns on its proper footing, as affecting the Ministers and advisers of

\* In a very remarkable letter he had to write to the Earl of Shrewsbury, in the year 1575, he so feelingly describes the perplexity of his situation, that we cannot forbear anticipating matters so far, as to transcribe a part of it. He assures Lord Shrewsbury, that he never indeed had given just cause by any private affection of his own, or for himself, to offend the Queen of Scots ; but that whatsoever he did was for the service of his own Sovereign Lady and Queen ; which, if it were yet again to be done, he would do ; he knew, and did understand, that he was in *this contrary sort* maliciously depraved ; in secret sort on the one part, and that of long time, that he was the most dangerous enemy and ill-wisher to the Queen of Scots. On the other side, that he was also a secret well-wisher to her and her title, and that he had made his party good with her. " Now, my Lord," he goes on to say, " no man can make both these agree together, but it sufficeth for such as like not me in doing my duty, to *deprave* me. In all these crossings, my good Lord, I appeal to God. As for the Queen of Scots, truly I have no spot of evil meaning to her ; neither do I mean to deal with any titles to the Crown. If she shall intend any evil to the Queen's Majesty my Sovereign, for *her* sake, I must and will mean to impeach her ; and therein I may be her unfriend and worse." As Queen Mary was at this very time in the custody of Lord Shrewsbury, to whom the letter was addressed, it might be regarded as a sort of friendly warning to that unfortunate Princess, not to give too much countenance to Elizabeth's *decided enemies*, with whom she certainly always found means to hold more intercourse than is generally apprehended.—See an account of this letter, *Strype's Annals*, ii. 570, 571 ; and the letter itself in *Lodge's Illustrations of English History*, No. CIII.

Queen Elizabeth, we shall be the better able to pursue the course of those extraordinary events, which became objects of perpetual care and attention to the English Government, and in which Lord Burghley will be found constantly to have occupied so conspicuous and so arduous a situation.

Henry VIII., it must be confessed, had done every thing he well could do, to embroil the two kingdoms of England and Scotland, by passing over the claims of his eldest sister, in the settlement of the succession ; and so preferring the issue of his younger sister, after his own children, as to make it amount to a positive and absolute exclusion of the elder branch of his family.\* This alone was enough to excite the most acrimonious feelings and jealousies, independent of all other aggravating coincidences.

We must not wonder, therefore, that Mary, having passed into France, in defiance of *England*, as she boasted to have done in a conference with Throckmorton, † the English minister, and being betrothed and finally married to the heir of that great kingdom, her relations there should have felt disposed to assert her claims upon England, especially against Elizabeth, whom all sound Catholics had been taught to regard as the spurious offspring‡ of the heretical Henry.§

In all this, there is nothing certainly to excite surprise, though it was calculated in every way, as has been before intimated, to rouse the resentment of England, and stimulate her to uphold and defend a Queen of her own choice ; for so we may reasonably conclude Elizabeth to have been, not only from the early and unanimous acknowledgment of her title on the demise of Mary, but from the great popularity she is known to have possessed, from the first moment of her accession.

We have now seen what was the course of things in the first and second

\* Might not this have arisen more immediately from his anger against both Mary's parents ? Against James, for having so decidedly resisted his counsels and his friendship ; and against Mary of Guise, for having refused to marry him, as has been credibly reported ?—See *the Life and Reign of Elizabeth*, London, 1740, vol. i. 73. and *Thompson's Memoirs of the Court of King Henry VIII.*, 463.

† Cabala.

‡ Campbell's Case of Mary Queen of Scots, p. 136.

§ When Elizabeth was in trouble on the occasion of Wyatt's rebellion, Henry II. of France sent privately to her letters full of assurances of love and friendship, inviting her to France ; though his reason for such invitation, it is supposed, says the historian, was to make way for the Queen of Scots, who was appointed to be his daughter-in-law, to possess herself of the Crown of England after the death of Mary.—*Life of Elizabeth*, 82.

years of Queen Elizabeth's reign; and we are disposed to believe, that the following very curious points in history will be admitted to have been proved and established. That on Elizabeth's accession, a disposition was shewn in France, not merely to dispute, but wholly to set aside, her presumed right to the throne, by advancing Mary of Scots' claim, in so visible and notorious a manner as could not be misunderstood. That notwithstanding the peace of *Cateau Cambrensis*, the French King continued to keep an army in Scotland, upon pretence of *rebellion* on the part of those who, having imbibed the Protestant principles and belief, wished to secure to themselves liberty of conscience, and, in the absence and during the foreign connexions of their native Sovereign, to maintain the ancient rights and customs of the country, and to reserve for "*Scottish men*," in preference to foreigners, the occupation of the principal offices of the realm; to uphold, besides, the next heirs of the crown, in their reversionary rights, should their absent Queen die issueless. It may be added, that the army *ostensibly* so opposed to the *Protestant Confederates* was in the way of receiving large reinforcements, beyond the *alleged* necessity of the case, and therefore could not fail to be extremely threatening and hazardous to England, in the weak state of her frontiers, and under the avowed pretensions of Mary to the English Crown, especially having the command of many forts and harbours.

It seems clear, also, that on the death of Henry II. of France, the danger to England became more manifest in many ways; as first, in the succession of Francis II., married to the Queen of Scots; in the great power of the family of Lorrain, then increased, not only by the accession of Francis, but by the removal of rival counsellors (particularly the Constable Montmorency), and eagerly inclined on all accounts to forward and promote their niece's claim to the crown of England; having two great means of enforcing this claim by the way of *Scotland*; first, through the Regency of Mary of Lorrain, the Queen Dowager, and in the religious disputes, judged to afford a plausible pretence for augmenting their forces in that kingdom.

It seems also proved, by what has already been said, that the English Court had very just reason to regard Scotland as the great seat of danger, and to apprehend, that if the Lorrain and Catholic party were suffered to prevail against the Protestant Confederates, her own doom was sealed; and that in the comparatively defenceless state of the Northern frontier, it might be suddenly assailed by the French, or French and Scots united, and that it was, therefore, her most



obvious interest to uphold the Protestant party, and enter into such compacts as might appear necessary to secure liberty of conscience to the favourers of the Reformation in Scotland, the maintenance of her ancient rights, and on the ground of a religious conformity, if it could be brought about, might lead to a durable and permanent amity between the two countries. The Treaty of Edinburgh had a reference to all these points; it provided against any offensive or alarming claim to the crown of England on the part of Mary; it was designed to keep Scotland clear of French soldiery, and, consequently, to guard against any attack upon England from that quarter by the French (or French and Scots united), securing to the Protestant party in Scotland sufficient protection, or, at least, forbearance, on the part of the French Court or Scottish Catholics.

The death of Francis II., unless this treaty should be fully ratified, seemed to invalidate all that had passed. Mary was now in sole right Queen of Scotland, and at liberty to return to her native dominions in full sovereignty; and if there had been no question about the security of England, and of Elizabeth, the acknowledged Sovereign of England, and of the Protestant interest in both countries, her passage from France to Scotland would of course have been a simple transaction, and one with which, probably, no other state would have been disposed to interfere; but the case in reality was far different: she was still completely in the hands of her uncles of Lorraine; her education had been entirely French, and such, therefore, of course, were her habits and manners. She had been bred a Roman Catholic, in the bosom of a rigidly Roman Catholic family, and she had been notoriously encouraged, not only to consider herself presumptive heiress to the crown of England, after Elizabeth, but as actual Queen of England, in contempt of the claims of Elizabeth, which were judged to be altogether spurious—she had also been taught to regard the Congregation in Scotland as *rebels* to her authority, and, in their combination with England, particularly opposed to her on the ground of religion.

It would be difficult to say how the posture in which she stood could have been rendered more suspicious to England, or to the Confederate Lords in Scotland, then in alliance with the former country. We must regard home securities as the main objects of all diplomacy. It cannot reasonably be wondered, that the English Ministry, whether at home or in France, should be anxiously concerned to procure, if possible, that the widowed Queen might return to her own dominions on terms conformable to the Treaty so recently concluded at Edinburgh, in which Elizabeth's title to the English crown and to Ireland was fully, and

exclusively of all competitors, recognised; in which liberty of conscience and pardon were secured to the Protestant party, and in which every guard had been put upon the undue and irregular influence of foreign interests. These were certainly points of great importance, whether they regarded England or Scotland; they were points which the real friends of *both* countries might well be excused for seeking to establish upon a firm footing, by procuring the young Queen to ratify the treaty before she returned to her own country. But when we look to the other side of the question, we must equally admit that Mary was in the way to be wholly set against that treaty, as in no small degree compromising her rights, both as a claimant to the English throne, and as the mistress of her own subjects. On the death of Francis, her situation in the French Court was greatly changed; she was too much of a Lorrainer to be trusted, or admitted to the confidence of Queen Catherine de Medicis, her mother-in-law,\* or of the new King, or of the Princes of the blood, who were strangely associated with *Catherine*, at *that* time, as a counterpoise to the *Guise* faction. Mary, in truth, had enemies on all sides when she first began to entertain thoughts of returning from France to Scotland; and what, perhaps, was still more unfortunate, she had *friends* also on all sides, so likely to embroil matters and render her reign uneasy, that whatever might be the private character of either of the two Queens, now brought, as it were, into immediate contact with each other, it would be almost absurd to suppose that either of them could have escaped the difficulties arising out of the general confusion of European politics, or the strifes and controversies of religion. To

\* It is, we believe, not very generally known, that the death of Francis was attended with very suspicious and strange circumstances. We copy the following from the History of Elizabeth, by Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio:—"La Mort de Francois II. suspendit le coup qu'on alloit porter au Prince de Condé. Malgré l'excessive délicatesse de temperament du roi, sa mort fit naître des soupçons qui n'ont jamais été éclaircis. Catherine de Médicis en fut l'objet: on ignore si ce crime n'effraya point son ame cruelle. Au milieu du tumulte où étoit la cour, les restes du jeune roi, furent, longtemps abandonnés, et pour ainsi dire oubliés; on pensa enfin à lui donner la sépulture, mais plutôt pour se délivrer d'un soin importun, que pour lui rendre un devoir, sa mère et ses oncles dédaignèrent d'assister aux funérailles, Marie Stuart, renfermée dans son appartement, outragée par la reine sa belle-mère, abandonnée de la cour, obtint à peine que ses deux gouverneurs, et un seul évêque conduisissent à Saint Denis le corps de son mari." The same writer tells us, that the people were so shocked at this neglect, that a billet was thrown on the coffin to this effect: "*Tanneguy du-Chastel, où es-tu? Mais tu étois François.*"—Tanneguy du-Chastel being banished from the Court in the time of Charles VII., came back on purpose to bury his Sovereign at his own expense, in defiance of the wrath of Louis XI. "*Mais tu étois François,*" evidently referred to the *Guises*, as well as the Queen-mother, they being equally accounted *foreigners* to France.

these we must look for the real history of the misfortunes of *her* who *sank* in the *struggle*, while, in common justice to the other party, as strict an account as possible should be taken of those misfortunes which, *though escaped*, were *constantly threatening*, and only evaded at last by incessant vigilance, a constant care to give the enemy no advantage, and to preserve all that had been already obtained in favour of Elizabeth's right to the crown, in favour of Protestantism, both in England and Scotland, and in favour of the general liberties of mankind, wherever attacked, by the ancient bigotry and tyranny of Catholicism.

It is taking a very narrow view indeed of the policy of England, at this most momentous period, to confine it to little points of personal jealousy, or merely national rivalry. There was a common cause on foot throughout Europe, of much greater magnitude, and in regard to which, the two Queens stood quite as much opposed to each other, as could be the case in respect to the competition for the English crown. Nor is it at all too much to say, that in this opposition to each other, the greater strength was on the side of Mary. Elizabeth stood forward as the champion of the weaker, though most *popular* cause; while Mary had the whole support of the bigoted and domineering party, ready to afford her such countenance as was totally wanting on the other side—we mean the full weight of that *superstitious awe and veneration* which still bound a large majority, in most of the kingdoms of Europe, to the hierarchy of Rome, and gave as much force as ever to the decrees and fulminations of an angry Pontiff.

We have already observed, that it is too common with the world, to think that because Mary fell, Elizabeth was comparatively in a state of less jeopardy and danger; but had not the latter been supported by such Ministers, as French perfidy, Italian subtlety, Spanish bigotry, and German power, never before had to contend with, as her cause was at first the weakest, her danger would have been constantly the greatest; being threatened in all directions by those who, on the ground of religion alone, and at all events, could not but be regarded as Mary's friends, and Elizabeth's foes.

Francis II. had scarcely breathed his last, before Mary found it necessary to retire from the French Court to her uncles of Lorrain: though even before that, she seems to have received many applications from England, to have the new Treaty of Edinburgh ratified, on which so much depended at this formidable period. So early as the 5th of January, one month only after the death of Francis, according to Lord Burghley's notes, intelligence appears to have been received



in England, from Sir Peter Meutas, who had been dispatched to France for the purpose, that Mary refused to confirm the Treaty. On the 23d of the same month, according to the same notes, "the Earl of Bedford was sent to France, where Sir Nicholas Throgmorton was then ambassador; amongst other things, to require the ratification of the Treaty of Edinburgh, and to compliment Charles IX. on his accession." On the 16th of February the Earl "arrived at Fontainebleau;" and on the 26th he and "Sir Nicholas wrote home, that having demanded of the Queen of Scots the ratification of the Treaty of Edinburgh, she had deferred it 'till she might have some of hir nobilitie of Scotland there in France with hir." It is impossible not to feel for Mary's distressing situation at this time, which exposed her, at so trying a moment, to the interruption of such unpleasant embassies; and it may teach us the better to appreciate the comparative blessings of a more private station: but that there was ample reason, in a political point of view, thus early to ascertain, if possible, her feelings and sentiments, with regard to the Treaty of Edinburgh, the great work of Cecil, cannot be doubted by any who shall have carefully and impartially considered the dangers with which both England and Scotland were threatened, if Mary should be found decidedly averse from the tenor, spirit, and principles of that celebrated compact. In the month of March, Mary received a visit from her natural brother, the Lord James Stuart, sent to France expressly to invite her home, specially *commissioned* indeed to attend upon her by the Lords of the Congregation; and to him she first appears to have communicated her intention of returning to her native dominions, which he was not backward to encourage her to do, hoping, however, to obtain that influence over her, which might secure to himself and his party the advantages they had acquired in the late struggle; while the House of Lorraine was secretly looking to a totally different issue of things: they expected to acquire fresh power, by having their niece removed from France to the seat of her own sovereignty in Scotland, and becoming thereby an object to neighbouring Princes, who, in the hopes of marrying her, might court their friendship, and use them as mediators.\* In the mean while, as they could bear no good will to the Scottish Protestants, Mary was already placed between two adverse parties, independently of all jealousies on the side of England, which latter could not be expected to regard what was passing with indifference, being all the while deeply implicated in the issue of things, especially as to the influence either party might obtain over Mary.

\* Buchanan.

If the views of the English Government, at this moment, had been entirely adverse to the peace and happiness of the young Queen, on the prospect of her return to her native dominions, it might well be accused of wanton cruelty, and the most barbarous intentions; for Mary had indeed enough to contend with, without any interposition on the part of England. Speaking of the consent of her uncles in France (after much deliberation as it would seem) to let her pass into Scotland, on the invitation of the Lord James, Buchanan writes, that “the Queen’s resolution swayed much in the case, who was determined to return into her own country; for her husband was dead, and her mother-in-law (who managed matters of state) shewing some disgusts towards her, she saw she should grow cheap at that Court,\* and though she had been but little used to Government,† yet being in the spring and flower of her age, and of a lofty spirit, she could not bear to cringe under another: she had rather have any fortune with a kingdom, than the richest without one.” We are not disposed to cite Buchanan generally, as to the fortunes of this much pitied Queen, but his account, in this instance, with the trifling exception we have noticed, appears to be most true, and it serves to shew, what is not always regarded, that the unhappy Mary had *female enemies*, or, at least, false friends, in the Court *from which she came*, and who could have no such powerful causes of jealousy personally, as was the case with Elizabeth. Catherine de Medicis hated the *Guises*; but a

\* Catherine de Medicis, in fact, in order to get the Government of France into her own hands, heartily wished Mary out of her way, and, for the little love she bore to the *Guises*, might have wished that she had no independent kingdom to resort to, or that her consequence was much less in the world than it really was.

“The Queen Dowager,” says Dr. Cook, speaking of Catherine de Medicis, “a woman of unbounded ambition, and the most furious passions, had viewed, with the utmost jealousy, envy, and indignation, the ascendancy which the beauty, accomplishments, and talents of his Queen had acquired over the feeble mind of Francis; and she had no sooner, in consequence of his dissolution, regained the direction of affairs, than she acted towards her daughter-in-law with a degree of coldness, or of contempt, which wounded her pride, and aggravated her sorrows.”

Finally, the French historian, Daniel, tells us, that Mary, “had it been in her power, would have chose rather to reside in France with the title of Queen Dowager, than to sit upon the throne of Scotland; but the *Queen Mother could not endure her*.”

† This must be received with some qualification, if the following account be true, which Throckmorton sent to Cecil in the first year of Elizabeth’s reign: “And seeing the house of *Guise* now ruleth, with whom I am in very small grace, and that the *Queen of Scotland (who is a great doer here, and taketh all upon her)* hath so small an opinion of me, as I shall be able to do small service with her.” This letter is dated July 13, 1559.—*Forbes*, i. 160.



temporary Court influence was all *she* had at stake. Elizabeth's stake, as regarded Mary, was a crown; a crown disputed, claimed, and, by many Catholics in all countries, assigned to the latter as her just inheritance, and in defiance particularly of her who wore it, as the Protestant daughter of the apostate Henry—for such he was looked upon at Rome.

Of the view taken by the English Government of the aspect of things at this time, we may form a good judgment from a memorial sent to Thomas Randolph, "to execute diverse thinges for the service of the Quenes Majestie in Scotland," taken from a minute of Secretary *Cecil*. It is dated March 17, 1560 (i. e. 1560-1), just before the Lord James left Scotland to visit his sister in France. We may look upon it probably in the light of instructions from the English Court, in regard to the embassy on which Lord James was going; and there can be little doubt but that it proceeded wholly from the pen of the celebrated Minister whose life we are writing.

Randolph was to *make it known in Scotland* that "the Protestant Princes of Germany, being assembled at Nawenburgh on the 20th of January last past, for the renovation of the league made heretofore, for a mutual defence of themselves against the Pope and all his adherents, had sent to the Queen (Elizabeth) intelligence of their doings, requiring her Majesty to continue in her religion, and to further the like in *Scotland*,—he was therefore commissioned to declare to such of the Nobility of Scotland as were inclined to the same cause, that her Majesty saw daily, that no amity or friendship so certain between the two kingdoms could be established, as that which should be grounded on an unity and consent in Christian religion—he was therefore to solicit such to persevere, and if he saw any perplexed with doubts, to remind them, how well the profession stood then in France, where freedom was granted to all persons to live with a free conscience, who should observe common peace and tranquillity; so that the Nobility of Scotland, observing common peace amongst themselves, and rendering *their duty to their Sovereign*, in things concerning their obedience, there would be no cause to fear any power to offend them. That he should represent to all who had the amity of the two realms at heart, that now, whilst their Sovereign is unmarried (a widow) and out of the country, the very time is to make an accord between the two realms, either for a perpetual peace, or, at the very least, very long to continue. And while the Queen of Scots and Scotland is free from the unprofitable old league with France, to make either a new league between the two Queens and their realms, or to annul or qualify



such heads or articles of the old league with France, as had been frequent occasions of quarrel between the two realms. Thinking this a good opportunity for the Scottish Nobility to *induce their Queen* not only to allow of the device, but for *her own sake* to be very desirous of it. The Kings of Scotland in time past must have seen what ruin and hostility from England, proceeding only from the old league with France, had come upon their country; so that being now free to remedy the same, if that league shall be knitt up again, the Queen herself and her posterity would most repent it. That it was now extremely necessary for them to consider with whom their Queen should marry, for if she again married a stranger, the same evils or worse might ensue, and those who had lately stood forth in defence of the ancient rights and liberties, might, if they stood not well in her favour, be brought to great danger by such a marriage; and that therefore they should endeavour to persuade their Queen to marry at home,\* or else, not without some great security to those who ought to succeed; that is, stood in the proper line of inheritance. That the Duke of Chatelherault and all his family ought to see, that to them there remaineth no other surety than this service; while all others who had not yet intermeddled, should perceive of how great importance it was that she should match with such a husband, as might bring universal quietness to her kingdom, and sure peace with England. And that the said Randolph should use his discretion in conferring with such as were well addicted to the cause of religion, and to the good amity between the two realms."—Such was *Cecil's* view of the case only five months before Mary came to Scotland; for though she is known to have arrived in the year 1561, March 17, 1560, was, according to the reckoning in our days, in the same year.

Must we be expected to say, that this was drawn up by any professed, or even insidious enemy to Queen Mary? The whole was admirably fitted exactly to preserve her from those distractions which afterwards involved her in ruin. It was no fault of the English Government, that Protestantism and Catholicism (to speak according to the language of the times) were at issue with each other in most of the states and kingdoms of Europe. The case was so; Elizabeth and the Congregationists of Scotland, had taken their part, in the common struggle of Europe, and it was rather wishing well to Mary than otherwise, to place her

\* At this very time the Princes of Lorraine were seeking to marry her to Charles of Austria, who is said to have demanded sufficient security, that in case they should marry, Mary's claim to the English crown should be effectually prosecuted.

at the head of a party, which we know better now perhaps than ever, was contending for the dearest rights of man; freedom of conscience; freedom of opinion; and release from a thralldom the most odious and irrational; not merely in conjunction with Elizabeth or *Cecil*, or *perfidious* England, as the expression of some is, but with all the foreign Reformists; the Lutherans of Germany, the Hugonots of France, the Zuinglians, or Calvinists of Switzerland. Mary, unhappily, would not be persuaded to take this part, but it was laid open to her, and put to her choice. She was, upon the advice of England, through its agent Randolph, to be solicited to make common cause with the Protestant Princes of Germany, the Protestants of France, among whom were several Princes of the blood, the Protestants of her own realm, among whom was her natural brother, and the presumptive heirs to her throne, and with the Protestant Queen of England, her nearest neighbour, and who could be her friend, politically speaking, on no other terms. If the hint about the marriage be judged an unworthy restraint upon an independent Queen, what shall we say of the interference on this head in the case of Mary of England, or of the endeavours made to marry Elizabeth, when Princess, to some foreign Prince, merely to get her out of the way?

Mary evaded all Cecil's pleas and proposals; but in this, as far as regarded her religion, she acted upon her *own* principles, and must stand excused:—\* principles that had many powerful fautors—but it manifestly threw her out of the line of that concord and amity recommended by England, and from which line England herself could not depart, consistently, honourably, or safely.

\* Not merely excused, but commended—we can join with all those who think highly of her conscientious adherence to her own religion; but we cannot in the same degree blame those who desired her conversion to Protestantism. Some of the nearest relatives and descendants of Francis I. had become Protestants, and it was no unkindness in those who were such upon conviction, to wish Mary to be so instructed as to see her errors. We are led to make the above distinction from the following passage in Mad<sup>re</sup>. Keralio's History. Speaking of Mary's appointment of a Protestant Ministry and Council, she observes, “*Que pouvoit-elle faire de plus? Renoncer à sa foi? C'etoit ce que desiroient les predicans, la noblesse, et la Reine d'Angleterre: mais la foi de Marie etoit trop sincere, et sa conscience trop pure, pour acheter la paix et le repos par une lache abjuration des sentimens de son cœur.*”—At all events, this censure contains an acknowledgment, that those who sought her conversion, had her quiet and happiness in view, not as the purchase of a base apostacy, but of an honest conviction. Could Mary of England have been brought to listen to the instructions of Ridley, [see vol. i. pp. 432. 544.] how much happier and peaceful, and beneficial to her subjects, might her life and reign have been.

Mary, it may be now said, was to be pitied ; but Elizabeth, at the same time, was equally acting on *her* principles,\* and had *she* fallen, she would have excited probably no pity at all in her adversaries. Mary is said to have been of a temper naturally violent, and impatient of contradiction, having been flattered in France, on account of her personal charms.—(*McCrie*, vol. ii. 22.) This seems very much to be confirmed by her spirited conversation with Throckmorton, of which we shall have more to say, and which may be seen in the *Cabala*. We are not saying these things to prejudice her cause, but to account for resentments, and weaken a little, if we can fairly do it, the force of those bitter and unqualified invectives heaped upon Elizabeth and her Ministers, as though all hostilities against Mary, rested on no other foundation than a frivolous and womanish competition on the score of beauty and accomplishments. It may be impossible to make Elizabeth appear amiable, but that she received from France, the most glaring affronts on her elevation to the English throne, can never be denied ; and unfortunately for Mary, more from *her* immediate relations than from any others, nor is it reasonable to expect that a daughter of Henry VIII., in an age of relentless cruelty, should have inherited a very soft or tender heart ; yet, after all, we expect to be able to shew, that she treated the competitor for her throne with more forbearance than was the case with many of her contemporaries. What an example had been afforded her of summary vengeance, in the deplorable case of Lady Jane Grey ! and yet Mary was eighteen years in the power of Elizabeth. While we feel for Mary, therefore, we are not always bound to bow to the feelings of her *very partial* advocates.† We do not of course allude to those who have employed themselves to detect forgeries, which always should be detected if they can ; nor yet to those who have taken every fair means of extenuating the faults of this most unfortunate Princess ; but to those who, in resentment of her sufferings, have loaded Elizabeth, and all her Ministers (but particularly the subject of this Memoir), and a large party in Scotland, with, as we said before, *unqualified invectives*, as though she alone were the marked object of all their measures, and without any other end in view than her humiliation, deprivation, and destruction. Whereas, the

\* “ A kingdom,” says Camden, “ brooketh no companion, and Majesty more heavily taketh injuries to heart.”

† “ There is something amusing,” says the author of the *Biographia Britannica*, [Art. *Buchanan*, Note 5.] “ in the extreme zeal which some late authors have discovered for the honour and reputation of Queen Mary. It appears a kind of literary Quixotism.”



only historical view to take of the subject, is to consider, by what inevitable circumstances, she fell into the vortex of a revolution extending itself throughout Europe, and of which it only happened to be her fate to be one of the most conspicuous, most lamented, and most splendid victims.

The Lord James's embassy (for he had his commission, as we have said, from a convention of estates) to the widowed Queen, his sister,\* was certainly designed to prepare her as much as possible, to return to her own country and dominions, upon a footing of confidence with *his* party, and under a hope probably of leading her to take such measures, as might not undo what had so recently been accomplished, to free her subjects from a foreign yoke, and ensure to such as had espoused the cause of the Reformation, liberty of conscience. There might, at least, have existed a possibility of her becoming detached from the bigoted counsels of her foreign advisers, by forming some new alliance more friendly to the interests of Scotland and of England; or by inducing her to confide more in her natural born subjects, than in any foreigners. In this case, as in all others, we should look to the alternative of her returning to her own country, under different impressions. What hope could there be for the friends of the Reformation, what confidence could they have that the member of a Church, which notoriously encouraged all practicable deceit and dissimulation, would not resist the attacks making on the Pope's authority, and take measures to reduce all stragglers to their pristine obedience?

But it is pretty well known, that in all that Lord James was doing to procure security for the Protestants, he had been forestalled by a different agent from Scotland. Leslie, afterwards Bishop of Ross, had been with the Queen before the arrival of the Lord James, for the very contrary purpose, of prepossessing her *against* the *Protestants*, and to persuade her, on her return, to land where *they* were so few, and her *Catholic* adherents so numerous, as to afford her every fair means, by the weight of her authority, and an army at her command

\* In Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. iii. part ii. No. 71., there is a letter from Mary to the English Ambassador, in which she seems decidedly to say, that her brother had no charge or commission. The note or letter has a wrong date in the Oxford edition, purporting to be written à Nanci ce 22 d'Avril, 1662, at which time, Mary, as is well known, was in Scotland; but the next letter, No. 72, from Sir N. Throckmorton to the Queen, abundantly explains it. Dr. Cook thinks, Mary denied the Lord James's *commission*, in order to evade Throckmorton's suggestion, that, having communicated with him, she must be apprised of the sentiments of her council in Scotland, for which she professed to be waiting.

(of, at the least, 20,000 men), of overthrowing the Reformed Church at once, before it had had time to settle itself.

We may form some opinion from these two embassies, or missions (for Leslie appeared as the Representative of the Catholics),\* how divided a country she was about to revisit, and how little chance there was of peace and quietness, if she should make a wrong choice in the appointment of her first council, or in the distribution of her favour.

That she was a Romanist in all her principles and feelings there can be no doubt; that Leslie's advice was most consonant with the general views of her friends in France, can be as little questioned: but the juncture did not appear favourable to the adoption of Leslie's opinion. The House of Lorrain had too much to do at home, to give much support to its friends in Scotland, and the army that had just returned from thence gave no encouragement to such precipitate measures. She was, therefore, rather *allowed* to listen to the Lord James, and to regulate her return according to *his* direction and representation of affairs.

And what had England to do on this occasion? certainly, as much as possible to insist upon the ratification of the late concluded Treaty, not as a ground of quarrel, but the best preparatory step to a firm and stable peace between the two kingdoms, the security of England being otherwise left in a most precarious state. Throckmorton had a hard task upon his hands in pressing this measure upon Mary, against her Six uncles of the House of Lorrain, who accompanied her even to the very water's edge, on her departure from France, and by whom, no doubt, she was encouraged to act that part, which we may admire, rather than approve. She had requested Elizabeth to be allowed to pass through England; it is easy to regard the *refusal* of such a request, as too marked an affront to be borne with any patience; as betraying a want of courtesy bordering upon barbarity, a feeling of superiority ill becoming a Queen of, *perhaps*, less royal pretensions; to deny a widowed Queen of such tender years, a passage to her own dominions, must be allowed, *without further consideration*, to impress every feeling mind with a most unfavourable opinion of Elizabeth's delicacy of sentiment and tenderness of heart. But she has had more laid to her charge, than should be always

\* His mission was the result of a meeting, held very privately, by the Earls of Huntley (always wavering), Crawford, Atholl, Sutherland, the Bishop of Murray, and Leslie himself, Bishop of Ross.

credited; especially, where we have reasons afforded us to think, that she often found her match in such apparent freaks of jealousy.

Let us consider in the first place, that the request was not unconditionally or peremptorily refused. If Mary would but consent to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh,\* she was not only to be permitted to pass through England, but to be entertained and escorted on her way with all due honour. This she strenuously however, refused to do, and not merely *resented* Elizabeth's refusal, but with a degree of *pride* and *contempt* not to be mistaken, blamed herself for having *condescended* to ask such a passage; and with a resolution, certainly well befitting an independent Queen, but yet notoriously bespeaking no small anger against Elizabeth and her Ministers, if not a positive *contempt* of both, determined to brave the perils of the sea, and find her way home by the German Ocean.

Here then she was a match for Elizabeth; we discern in her conduct the features of a heroine, and must admire her spirit, while we foresee the bad consequences of such a defiance; but we must consider the political bearings of the case. The stability of Elizabeth's throne may be said to have been involved in the question concerning the ratification of the Treaty of Edinburgh;† Mary was

\* Mary certainly ought to have ratified the Treaty according to the powers given to the Commissioners; which bore her name as well as that of Francis, and with the following distinctions in the date of their respective authorities over Scotland. "L'an de *noz* regnes, assavoir de France le premier, et d' Escosse les deux et (dix septieme.)" See the Commission itself, *Forbes*, i. 397.

† In the history of the life and reign of Elizabeth, 1740, evidently after Rapin, it is said, "Mary, on her side, had *strong reasons* to elude this ratification; she was persuaded Elizabeth was not the legitimate daughter of Henry VIII., and that neither his will, nor an act of parliament, could give her a right which nature denied." If Mary was under such a mistake, with regard to the power of an English act of parliament at this period, the author ought to have known, that her opinion soon after was very different; when she took all the pains she could, in spite of Elizabeth, to procure a parliamentary recognition of her own claim; which, if her right by nature had been so preferable to that of Elizabeth, would have been, by this author's account, unnecessary. What he says afterwards is more to the purpose: and probably exceedingly true; "Upon this supposition, Mary believed the crown of England was fallen to her, as next heir to the deceased Queen; and though Elizabeth had possession, she did not despair of wresting it from her, with the assistance of France, Spain, the Pope, and the English Catholics. But if by ratifying the Treaty of Edinburgh, she owned herself in the wrong to assume the title of Queen of England, and promised with an oath never to bear it more, she had cause to fear her friends would grow very cool. To what purpose, then, did Francis order his plenipotentiaries to sign a treaty, which he did not intend to ratify? To this the answer is easy: he could not otherwise



now returning to Scotland, not merely as much as ever a suspicious competitor for the English crown, but an *angry* one. There was no foreboding what the consequences to England might be, if she returned to her kingdom in a state of feeling, totally adverse to the principles and basis of *that Treaty*. And nothing certainly was more to be expected, considering the school from which she came, the tutors she had been under, and the rival claims she had been encouraged to indulge.

That Mary was likely to return home not simply a competitor for the English crown, but an *angry* one, will appear from what follows. There is scarcely perhaps, a more curious document to be produced, from the archives of diplomacy, than Sir N. Throckmorton's long letter to Queen Elizabeth, printed in the Cabala; the date being from Paris, July 26, 1561, six months only after the death of Francis, and not so much as one before Mary's actual arrival in Scotland. If we may believe it to be all true (and there appears to be no reason to doubt it), Mary must have been a most extraordinary woman; and, considering all things, a proper match for Elizabeth. Elizabeth had just refused Mary's envoy, M. d'Oysel, a passage into Scotland through England, and even extended the restriction to Mary herself, on the ground "that she had not yet," as Camden writes, "according to her *faith given*, ratified the Treaty of Edinburgh;" and, according to the same author, she had rudely done this, "in presence of a great multitude standing by."

M. d'Oysel had returned to France, and made his report to Mary of all that had passed; let us now then pursue the tenor of the English Minister's extraordinary letter.

After stating that d'Oysel had, on the 17th, reported to Mary the answer he had received from Elizabeth, he writes, "and hearing also of the sundry *praises* and discourses made *here*, of *that your Majesty answered*, I sent to *Dampier* (a house of the Cardinal of Lorraine), to require audience of the Queen of Scots, which she appointed to have the next day, in the afternoon at St. Germaines. She was accompanied at *Dampier* with her uncles the Cardinals of *Lorraine* and *Guise*, and the Duke of *Guise*; there was also the Duke of *Nemours*."

On the 20th, Throckmorton waited on Mary according to appointment; and draw his forces out of Scotland, where they were besieged, nor oblige Elizabeth to recall hers. *As to the breach of his word, it did not then much concern the French Court.* Now as Mary was at that time in subjection to a husband, she threw upon him whatever was amiss in their conduct."

found M. d'Oysel talking to her. The English Minister explained to her, how earnestly the Queen, his mistress, desired to have the Treaty of Edinburgh ratified; he told Mary that she not only stood bound by her *hand and seal*, whereby the *French Commissioners* were *authorized*, but that many *promises of ratification* had passed, as well in the King's time, as by *herself since his death*. That a whole year had elapsed since the conclusion of the Treaty, which was to have been ratified in sixty days. "So that upon this unamicable and indirect dealing, the Queen, my mistress, hath refused you these favours and pleasures by you required; but if you can like to be *better advised*, and to *ratify the Treaty*, as you in *honour are bound to do*, her Majesty will not only give you and yours free passage, but also will be most glad to see you pass through her realm, that you may be accommodated with the pleasure thereof; and such friendly conference may be had betwixt you, as all unkindness may be quenched, and an assured perfect amity betwixt you both for ever established." Mary's reply to this, is certainly most remarkable for a young person of only nineteen years of age. She sat down by Throckmorton, desiring all other persons to retire, for fear she should give too much vent to her *passion*; "liking not," as she added, "to have so *many witnesses* to *my passions*, as the *Queen, your mistress*, was content to have when she talked with *M. d'Oysel*. There is nothing that does more grieve me, than that I did so far *forget myself*, as to require of the Queen, your mistress, that favour of which I had no need to ask; I needed no more to have made her privy to my journey, than she doth me of hers. I may pass well enough home into my own realm I think, without her passport or license; for though the late King your Master (Edward VI.), used all the impeachment he could to *stay* me,\* and *catch* me when I came hither; yet you know, *Mons. L' Ambassadeur*, I came hither safely, and I may have as good means to help me home again.—You know, both in *this realm*, and *elsewhere*, I have both *friends* and *allies*, and such as would be glad and willing to employ both their *forces* and *aid* to stand me in stead; I ask her nothing but friendship; I do not trouble her state, nor practise with her subjects; and yet I know there be in her realm that be inclined enough to have

\* This alone was enough to shew the rancour she had been taught to encourage against England. She had been betrothed to Edward, when the French stole her away from Scotland; and Edward was far more deserving of her hand than Francis II. but the whole transaction had been an offence to England, from the time it happened; for which see our first Volume.

*offers; I know also, they be not of the mind she is of, neither in religion nor other things."*

She next attempts to excuse herself entirely, from being answerable for any thing done in her husband's time; and pretends, that being by his death dissolved from all connexion with France, she was not to look for any further benefit from the *advice* of her *uncles*, but must seek to be advised by her own subjects. The latter, however, could scarcely be regarded by Throckmorton otherwise than as a pretence, as he told the Queen Mother; since two or three assemblies of the Scottish Nobles, had been held since the death of Francis, and a communication kept up by Mary; and yet this matter of the Treaty had never been propounded to them. He mentions next, the secrecy attending her arrangements for quitting France, and notices a remark of Henry of Navarre (afterwards Henry IV.) to be conveyed by his desire to Elizabeth; intimating it to be his opinion, that the King of France would shew himself more affectionate to Mary than to Elizabeth.

But there is one passage in Mary's discourse so passionately resentful of Elizabeth's refusal of a passport, that we cannot forbear transcribing it. "If my preparations were not so much advanced as they are, peradventure the Queen your mistress's unkindness might stay my voyage; but now I am *determined* to adventure the matter, *whatsoever come of it*. I trust the wind will be so favourable, as I shall not need to come on the coast of England; and if I do, then, *Mons. L'Ambassadeur*, the Queen, your mistress, shall have me in her hands, to do her will of me; and, if she be so hard-hearted as to desire my *end*, she may then do her pleasure, and make sacrifice of me."

These are lofty sentiments if she really expected to be murdered; but it is very extraordinary, that with six uncles in attendance upon her, three ready to accompany her,\* as well as the celebrated Bishop Leslie, she should have been allowed to run *such a risk*, if there had been any solid foundation for fancying, that her very life depended on such a mere contingency as a favourable wind, to keep her from the English shores. At all events, a more spirited defiance, was never, we think, heard of; and one, which she must have known, would be transmitted to Elizabeth, before she could have time to embark. But all defiances carry with them *provocation*; there had

\* *Viz.* The Duc d' Anmale, the Grand Prior, and the Marquis d' Elbœuf. See *Cook's History of the Reformation in Scotland*, iii. 53. The Bishop of Ross was also to sail with her, (*Castelnau*) and the eldest son of the Constable Montmorency.



been a great deal of shuffling on the part both of Francis and herself, with regard to the Treaty of Edinburgh, which was the main security of England and Scotland, against Catholicism and foreign subjection. Elizabeth had a clear right to desire to have it ratified—a great majority of Mary's own subjects wished to have it ratified before her return; upon these terms she was *invited*, cordially *invited*, to return by England to her native dominions, on a promise of being entertained and received with all due honour and distinction.—However spirited and magnanimous Mary's conference with Throckmorton may *now* be thought; and however much, knowing as we now do the catastrophe of her sad story, we may feel inclined to applaud her resentment of Elizabeth's refusal to let her pass through England, yet, so early to heap provocation upon provocation on Elizabeth's head, and with no small *scorn* of her *Ministers*, as well as of herself,\* was certainly a course of conduct, destitute of all prudence, and if the truth were known, probably arose from an inexperience at that time, of the spirit, vigour, and resolution, with which the affairs of England were about to be conducted. Mary might boast of her friends and allies, and the forces they would be glad to bring to her aid, but Elizabeth and her Council were not to be intimidated by such boasts, much less by any proud defiance.

It is, we believe, pretty generally understood and credited, that Elizabeth sent out a fleet to intercept Mary on her passage. It is not however a fact entirely capable of proof; the allusion supposed to be made to it in a speech of the Lord Keeper Bacon, seems to us to amount to the most direct testimony of such intentions on the part of the Queen and her Council. But if she had been intercepted, some, in their rage against Elizabeth, think she would never have been allowed to reach Scotland, or would, in short, have been destroyed. The times were bad enough for almost any thing, but we think we have proofs to shew, that she might have been intercepted for much better and more innocent purposes; we still feel, however, some hesitation in giving full credit to the fact. It is, we believe, admitted to be a good rule of negative moral evidence, that if a writer, having every inducement to mention an historical fact, does *not* mention it, the probability is, that it was not true.†

Now we find this moral evidence against it, in a curious little book, very

\* "She hath said," says Throckmorton, in another part of the same letter, "that, at her coming into Scotland, she will forthwith rid the realme of all the Englishmen there; namely, of your Majesty's agent there, and forbid mutual traffick with your Majesty's subjects."

† See *Gambier's Rules of Evidence*.

seldom cited in works regarding Scotland, but which has occasionally afforded us much amusement in tracing the effects of party prejudice. *Conæus*, a Scotch Catholic at Rome, of the very times of which we are writing, the author of a Life of Mary Stuart, dedicated in form to Pope Urban VIII. ; though nothing can exceed his inveteracy against Elizabeth for her hard usage of Mary, does not once mention this purpose of intercepting her on her voyage, much less the design to *destroy* her if she had been intercepted ; an omission, for which it would be difficult to account, if the fact had been universally, or even partially credited. But we are disposed to make use of this author a little further, and to produce him as a witness in extenuation of the design of intercepting her, even if it had been true.

Now, *Conæus* fully confirms the fact, that whatever might be intended against Mary, a trick of this very kind *was* actually meditated in the case of the Lord James, when he ventured into France to *invite*\* Mary to return. A regular plan, it seems, was suggested to Mary by his forerunner Leslie, who had arrived in France on a mission from the Scottish *Catholics*, one day only before the Lord James ; to *intercept* her brother, and, perhaps, send him into *Italy* or *Spain*, but at all events, by some means or other, *prevent his immediate return to his native country*. All which, this Catholic encomiast of Mary assures us, the Queen herself *highly approved*, and would certainly have carried into execution, had not the Lord James (the bastard, *Nothus*, as he is constantly called) by his soft speeches,† prevented her assenting to the wholesome remedy (“*sano remedio*,”) tendered to her by Leslie. The whole passage is really very curious. Leslie himself acknowledges, that he advised Mary to detain him, till all her own arrangements were completed.

Speaking of the Lord James’s mission from Scotland, whence he was coming, through England, *in order to be perfectly prepared for every wickedness and artifice*, he says, “*Sed impia viri concilia prudentiâ et celeritate prævenit Joannes Leslæus, à Catholicis, ad Principem destinatus. Hic de Nothi adventu Riegnæ exposuit, quæ ferret, quæ intenderet, admonens nullam ei fidem habendam, qui Religionem apud Scotos evertere, rerumque summam in se transferre moliretur : quod si intacta omnia, salvamque se cuperet, eum in Gallia detinendum curaret,*

\* McCrie’s Life of Knox, ii. 21.

† Very different reasons have been given for Mary’s attention to Murray, on this occasion. The most probable, certainly is, that her uncles counselled her to temporise with the Protestants, while their own hands were tied up by the disturbances in France.

vel si minus hoc placeret, in *Italiam*, aut *Hispaniam* mitteret oratorem. Hæc omnia Regina *laudavit* quidem, et *facile* quod *rogabatur* *effecisset* nisi superveniens Notus inanibus blanditiis optimam Principis mentem a sano remedio alienasset.”\*

We do not overlook the advantage that might be made of this passage, by the friends of Mary, considering how things turned out in the end, but we cite it to shew, that there was at least as much subtlety and artifice on the one side as on the other, by the confession of the Catholics themselves; for the Lord James had quite as great a right to give counsel to Mary as Leslie, and as much right to be allowed to return safe to those who sent him, and to his own country. Knox tells us, he had nearly been assassinated at Paris, but this does not appear to be very generally credited.

But had the Queen really been intercepted (for we cannot deny that there are some strong proofs of its having been contemplated), how does it follow that she would have come to any bodily harm? no proof exists, we can venture to say, that there was really any design of *totally* preventing her return to her native dominions. We have, in a letter from Maitland to *Cecil*, a curious statement of his opinion upon the subject, and the utmost of his wishes relating to her return, seems to have been, that she should have been “stayed a little,” that is, till things were more in order for her reception;† till they should have been able, for instance, to have brought their affairs into a more settled state, which her too quick return might tend to disturb or retard, or till she could, in England, be better instructed as to the true state of affairs in Scotland, and of the necessity, if any solid peace were to be expected to take place between the two kingdoms, or any firm friendship between the two Sovereigns, of her taking the Treaty of Edinburgh as the basis of her proceedings. “Some say,” says Rapin, “she escaped the English fleet in a fog, which waited to intercept her, but this is only a bare conjecture without proof. It is, however, very likely, that, as affairs stood between her and Elizabeth, if she had been taken, she would have been detained in England, *at least till she had ratified the Treaty of Edinburgh.*”

\* P. 44. This may serve, not to justify, but to account for the suggestion thrown out by Sadler, *Letters*, No. ccxxxiv. see note there. In justice to Sadler, it should be observed, that he only speaks of the detention of Montluc, by the Duke of Chatelherault, as a pledge for his own son detained in France.

† As nearly as can be what Leslie had recommended to be done with the Lord James. “Il lui conseilla,” they are the words of Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, “de retenir en France ce frere perfide, jusqu’à ce que, par sa prudence, elle aût rétabli l’ordre et la paix dans son royaume.”



As to Murray's design upon the crown, rumours to that effect we know were afloat, before the death of the Regent, but we also know that the French had an object in causing this to be believed, that they might with the more plausibility send troops to Scotland ; the advocates of Mary, however, feeling sure that if it were so, Elizabeth and *Cecil* must have been at the bottom of it, have, in more than one instance, cited the following passage from Throckmorton the English Ambassador in France, to *Cecil*, July 25, 1559, in *proof* of it.

" I am secretly informed, that there is a party in Scotland for placing the Prior of St. Andrews in the state of Scotland, and that the Prior himself, by all the secret means he can, aspires thereto." Now, if Elizabeth and *Cecil*, as it is often asserted and maintained, were at the bottom of all the Prior's plots and aspirings, one would think they would rather have sent such intelligence to Throckmorton, then receive it from him at Paris. But Paris, as we have before hinted, was the very place where at that time *false* rumours of this nature were afloat, and encouraged, to further the intentions of the Princes of Lorrain. Elizabeth and *Cecil*, indeed, seem to have been in the dark about it, since we find instructions sent to Sir R. Sadler, in Scotland, to inquire into the truth of such *rumours*, and if it were so as reported, neither to persuade or dissuade him,\* which sounds ill, but might bear this interpretation ; that, as *persuasion* could scarcely be otherwise than wrong on the part of England, *dissuasion* might, if useless, be extremely hazardous ; as likely to alienate him from the cause of England. For in all, instances, there was, to England, an extreme danger of hurrying the *disobliged* into the hands of Elizabeth's professed enemies. Murray, though a Protestant, and though he should pretend to the crown, to

\* See the special memorial for Sir Ralph Sadler, indorsed by *Cecil*, published in Sadler's Letters, Number ccxli., it must be observed, that the "enterprise toward the crown of Scotland," spoken of, would seem from other passages in the Memorial, to refer rather to the *Hamiltons* than Mary ; the *probability* of Mary's *demise without issue* is not only alluded to, but the possibility of the Duke of Chatelherault, being "very cold in his own cause;" i. e. as next heir. Mr. Chalmers, and others after, as well as before him, have regarded this as a positive and decided testimony of *Cecil's* design to instigate either the Duke or Murray to wrest the sceptre, "from the legitimate hand of the actual possessor," which are Mr. Chalmers's own words. Who would suppose, that the letter expressly referred to the contingency of the actual possessor's dying without issue?—We only wonder that the latter clause was not seized upon, to shew that the Secretary had a plan on foot, to provide for the removal of Mary by *assassination* before she *could have issue*. This would but have been one calumny more, added to the rude mass heaped on that celebrated statesman throughout the several pages of the history we refer to.

the *offence* of *France*, might, being *thwarted* or *disobliged* by *England*, turn to the House of *Burgundy* for support; it being quite as great an object to the latter, particularly to Philip II., to prevent the French becoming too predominant in Scotland, as it was to Elizabeth. When Henry II. of France, by persuasion of the Constable Montmorency, sent Melvil into Scotland to sift the report of Murray's design upon the crown, we know, that he returned to France persuaded of the falsehood of such charges, and yet it is alleged, that there must have been grounds for such suspicions, and that Elizabeth (and consequently *Cecil*) were privy to them, since in certain instructions to Lord Shrewsbury, the Queen is made to say, "Before the Treaty of Edinburgh there was an intent discovered to us by Lethington, to deprive her (Queen Mary) of her crown, which we utterly rejected;" and though Murray's *name* is not here mentioned; yet Camden asserts, that when *Cecil* met the confederate Lords prior to the Treaty of Edinburgh, "the *Lord James* propounded such things, as *Cecyl* judged neither meet to be propounded by subjects, nor by Princes to be granted." Still we think it very questionable, whether there was any allusion in these passages to a design upon the crown by Murray, and if there were, both Elizabeth and Cecil stand acquitted of all connivance or encouragement. The learned author of the Life of Knox, who is very anxious to make it appear that the Scottish Protestants were entirely loyal, in a long note upon the subject, thinks Murray was no such favourite in England, as to be encouraged \* to such an attempt, but concludes that it was otherwise with regard to *Arran*; and, that there is to this day sufficient evidence produced, to shew, that the Ministers of Elizabeth wished *him* to be raised to the throne of Scotland, and a union of the two crowns accomplished by his marriage with Elizabeth. Throckmorton's letters to Cecil are cited in proof of this, and particularly the

\* Some of the advocates of Mary, to shew that Murray *always* aimed at the crown, strangely enough refer to the evidence of the Duke of Norfolk, in 1569, who indeed, in a letter to Cecil, preserved in Haynes, writes, that Murray had his eye upon the crown, but expressly calls it "a *novel* intrigue; a *new* mark in his eye—no less than a kingdom," and this in 1569. (See *Goodall*.) The Duke also plainly acquits Elizabeth and Cecil of all thoughts that way, by the following curious expression: "He that hath been so bold with his own mistress as to bereave her of her kingdom and liberty, thinks it but a small matter to *refuse* to be *advised* with the Queens Majesty." The mark in his eye then of a *kingdom*, in 1569, was not only a *new* mark in the opinion of Norfolk, but encouraged, in defiance, it would seem, of Elizabeth, Cecil, &c. Two months before, Murray had been promoting the match between Norfolk and his sister, the Queen of Scots.—See *Haynes*, 520.

two following passages: "The way to perfait this assuredly is, that the erle of Arraine do as Edward IV. did, when he landed at Ravenspurg: (he pretended to the duchy of York; and having that, he would not leave 'till he had the *diademe*) for then of necessity the erle of Arran must depend upon the devotion of England, to maintein and defend himself. I fear all other devises and handelings will prove like an apotecary his shop; and, therefore, I leave to your discretion to provyde by all meanes for this matter both there and in Scotland;"—and again, "Methinks, the Lord of Grange, Ledington, Balnaves, and the chief doers of the Congregation (which I would wish specially to be done and procured by the Prior of St. Andrewes) should be persuaded to set forward these purposes before: for there is no way for them to have any safety or surety, onely this, make the Earl of Arran King; and as it is their surety, so it is also ours. In this mater there must be used both wisdome, courage, and spede."—Throckmorton, it is to be observed, was at this time the most confidential friend of *Cecil*, and in despatches from France, pressed the adoption of these measures which the *Secretary* had recommended to the Queen and Council; of course the reference is, to Throckmorton's Letters in Forbes's Collection. It is not to be denied, that the passages cited above are there to be found; but if they are to be considered as direct proofs of a combination between Throckmorton and Cecil, to deprive Mary of her Scottish crown, we ought not to overlook a proof, which the same Collection supplies, of its being rather a *French* than an *English* expedient; how far sincerely so, we pretend not to say, but it is very certain, that in Forbes's Collection there is to be seen a letter from Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth, dated from Amboise, May 4, 1560, and indorsed by Cecil himself, in which her Majesty is advertised, that a special messenger or minister is about to be sent to her from the *French* Court, a Monsieur de Randon. The account of this mission, is too important to be passed over; as tending to exculpate both Throckmorton and Cecil, from any violent design to wrest the Scottish crown from the *French* Queen (for so Mary was at the time).

"According to my last, Monsieur de Randon doth presentlie repaire to your Majesty. He is a faire spoken man, brother to the Conte Rochefokawe, and to the Abbot of Cormery (who ruleth altogether the Cardinal of Lorrain) and a good courtesan, very well esteemed in this Court, and of the faction of *Guise*. The chief cause of his coming is, as I am enformed, upon the newes they have here, that Lieth is wonne (whereby they take ther things in Scotland, and such



as may be prisoners ther to be in evill case) to treat with your Majesty touching the same) and for some good ende to be made betwene your Majesty and Fraunce. Nevertheles it is also shewed me, that he hath farther commission; and amongs other things, to offer unto your Majesty the realme of Scotland to be annexed to England, so as your Highnes do mary with the erle of Arraine: in which case, they will cause the Frenche Quene to renounce her title to Scotland for ever, in recompence whereof they will require to have at your Majesty's handes the renunciation of your title to Fraunce, to Calice, and the claime both of the money to be forfaite for default of rendition of Calice, and to all pensions, arreragis, and other droicts dew to your Majesty, and your realme by Fraunce, and to make a treatie and alliaunce with your Majesty; and for satisfaction of the Frenche Quene, to graunt, that in case the King dye, she shall have as much dowry as the revenue of the realme of Scotland cometh to. And as I do not easely beleave, the French will offer any thing so moche to your Majestys commodity as this is; which I wishe; so if any such thinge be indeed offered, it shall not, in my simple opinion, be amisse by all meanes to keep the same from the knowledge of the King of Spaine his Ministers and favorers there."

From Cecil's Journal it appears that M. de Randon was sent to England at this precise time; but that he ever made the proposals alluded to does not appear. He came, to use the very words of the Journal (or notes of Elizabeth's reign), "to joyn with de Valence to go into Scotland, and brought commissions for themselves, and Bp. of Amiens and d'Oyzell." This was about the space of four-and-twenty days only before Sir William *Cecil* himself and Dr. Wotton set out for Scotland, as Elizabeth's Ministers, to treat for peace; consequently before the Treaty of Edinburgh, and might therefore accord with the Queen's declaration to Lord Shrewsbury, alluded to, that "before the Treaty of Edinburgh there was an intent discovered to deprive her (Queen Mary) of her crown, which she (Elizabeth) utterly rejected." She says indeed it was discovered to her by Lethington, but let it have been discovered to her by whom it would, or devised by whom it might, it would seem from what Throckmorton writes of M. Randon, one of the very faction of *Guise*, that some project to that effect had been entertained in France, not perhaps with much sincerity, but in consequence of the "evil case" in which their affairs seemed to stand in Scotland. As to Arran himself, whether we look to England or to France, there might appear at that time to be a very fair chance of his ascending the Scottish throne, not

only through the failure of issue between Francis and Mary, but through the early demise of the *latter*, who, from Throckmorton's letters, appears, at the time of Elizabeth's accession, and first years of her reign, to have been in a state of health almost as delicate as Francis himself. In May, 1559, he writes to the Secretary, giving an account of his reception at the French Court: "The Scottishe Quene and this King's sister were absent: whome we have not seen as yet, for that (as it is said) they be sumwhat sickly;" and in a postscript to the same letter, after he had seen Mary, "Assuredly, Sir, the Scottishe Quene in myne opinion looketh very ill, very pale and grene, and therewithall short-breathed; and it is whispered here amongs them, that she cannot live long." In the next letter to the Queen herself, describing also his reception at Court, and his interview with Catherine de Medicis and her three daughters, he adds, "The Quene of Scotts being not there, for that she is sicklye." Many times after he speaks of her suffering from fainting fits, and once at *Notre Dame*, as being so ill, as "to keep her from sounding,\* they were fayne to bring her wine from the altar, and in dede I never sawe her loke so yll, and as well the Scottishemen as Frenchmen doo much mistrust, that she cannot long continue." And in a letter to Elizabeth, August 25, 1559, he mentions a report made to him by the Spanish Ambassador at the French Court, of her being so weak as to faint† in the Presence Chamber, being only revived by strong cordials.‡ It is no wonder therefore that the eyes of Elizabeth's Ministers should have been fixed on the Earl of Arran, as a proper match for their Sovereign; and that Throckmorton should have written to Elizabeth on the very day in which he had had the above communication with the Spanish Ambassador, "I wolde

\* Forbes, i. 144.

† Forbes, i. 210—244, &c.

‡ On the 19th of December, 1559, she had a very narrow escape for her life, by a fall in hunting. The following is the account of the accident sent to Elizabeth from France, by her envoys, Killebrew and Jones:—

"On the sixth of this present there happened a marvellous chance and escape to the French Queen: who riding on hunting, and following the hart of force, was in her course cast off her gelding by a bough of a tree, and by the suddenness of the fall, was not able to call for help; and albeit there did follow her divers gentlemen and ladies of her chamber, yet three or four passed over her before she was espied, and some of their horses rode so near her, that her hood was trodden off. As soon as she was raised from the ground, she spake, and said that she felt no hurt, and herself began to set her hair, and dress up her head, and so returned to the Court; where she kept her chamber till the King removed. She feeleth no incommodity by her fall, and yet she has determined to change that kind of exercise."—*Forbes*, i. 290.

wyshe your Majestie should honorablye and very graciously receive the Earl of Arran in your Court: gavyng him as good hope as any other (for yf he be the same that they here report of him, he is as well worthy as any other.)” And again, to prevent her delivering him up to the French, “Yf the Earl of Arran were not of so great importance as he is, in no wyse he is to be delivered; as I am suer, your Majesté dothe well consyder.”\*

If we put these things together, we shall see how different a case may be made out, from that which the constant enemies of Elizabeth, and her great Minister, *Cecil*, have so warmly insisted upon, and with little or no denial of the facts adduced. That there were rumours afloat of Murray's design to usurp the throne of Mary, is, probably, true; but if not first broached by the French, or by the Queen Regent in Scotland, which seems capable of proof,† chiefly encouraged by them, in order to afford a fair pretence for augmenting their forces in that country. That a match between Elizabeth and Arran was contemplated by Elizabeth's Ministers may be true, but upon a supposition that, being presumptive heir to Mary, he might ascend the Scottish throne through default of issue from her and Francis, or by the premature death of Mary herself, an event much expected, as we have shewn, from the apparent delicacy of her constitution. That a project was on foot even to raise Arran to the Scottish throne during Mary's life may be true, but not by violence; possibly by *such offers* made to France as might induce that Court to procure from Mary a peaceable resignation of her crown, or by proposals from the French themselves, such as Throckmorton reported as likely to be made by M. Randon, and by which, had Mary died young, as was undoubtedly expected, France would have gained great advantages. That France had speculated upon the probability of Mary's early death is plain, from Throckmorton's letter to the Queen, Nov. 29, 1559.—*Forbes*, i. 269.

But to let these things pass, it is very certain, as we have before intimated, that Mary's passage to Scotland, through England, was never unconditionally refused. If she would but previously ratify and confirm the Treaty of Edinburgh, she was not only to be permitted to pass free, but to receive all becoming and suitable attentions, and be with due honours forwarded on her way. What great pains were taken to induce her to do so before she sailed are evident from Lord Burghley's own notes. On January 5th, one month only after the

\* *Forbes*, i. 215, 216, &c.

† See *McCrie*, i. 443. *Knox and Forbes*, i. 180.



death of Francis, she was solicited to that effect by Sir Peter Meutas,\* sent from Elizabeth. On the 23d, the Earl of Bedford was dispatched to co-operate with Sir Nicholas Throckmorton in the same demand, which, on the 19th of February, was again declined. In March, Lord James went to her; and on the 10th of April, Throckmorton wrote three several letters to Mary, the Cardinal Lorrain, and the Lord James, to press the ratification. In June, Mr. Somer was sent upon the same errand, and the demand repeated by him and Throckmorton, and again finally on the 11th of August, but still refused or deferred. On the 15th of the same month she arrived at Calais to embark for Scotland. Having to the last thus refused to ratify that memorable treaty (Cecil's own treaty, as it might justly be called), Elizabeth's situation was rendered very precarious, as well as that of the Scottish Protestants or reformed party.† Some advantages to both might have been obtained, by apprising Mary of the exact state of her hereditary dominions before she arrived there; and if the alleged design of intercepting her is to be credited, it *might* assuredly have been for no worse ends or purposes than those we have suggested. We may learn from Elizabeth's instructions to Randolph, already cited, how much there was to communicate to Mary, when once out of the hands of the *Guises*, conducive to the best interests of both countries and the safety of both Queens. Camden's account of the design to intercept her on her passage is as follows:—"In the meantime the Queen of Scots, having gotten a fit opportunity, set sail from Calice and arrived in Scotland, passing by the English ships in foggy weather, which ships, some thought, were sent to do her honour by wafting her over; others, to suppress pirates; and others thought they were sent to intercept her; for James, the Bastard, having returned from France through England, gave advices underhand to intercept her, both for Elizabeth's security and the interest of religion. Lethington," he adds, "advised the same thing, lest, if she should return, she should raise wonderful tragedies, cut off their intercourse with the English, and depress the factions that favoured them." What Murray had learned in France does not appear, nor what he communicated to Elizabeth or her Ministers as motives for intercepting her; but it is not to be doubted that Mary was coming out of very bad hands, as far as regarded the liberties of Scotland, Elizabeth's title to the crown of England, and the reformed religion in both countries; and Murray and Lethington had, above most others, cause to

\* See before, pp. 197, 198.

† See Camden.

apprehend her resentment. Camden's expression, "if she should return," is too unqualified. The precise feeling of the parties is more truly to be ascertained from the letters that passed between Lethington and Cecil, and between Randolph and Cecil; the former writes as follows:—"I have been these forty days in the North parts with my Lord James (Murray), where we have not been altogether unoccupied, but advancing the religion and the common cause. I do allow your opinion of the Queen, our Sovereign's, journey to Scotland, whose coming hither, if she be enemy to the religion, and so affected towards that realm as she yet appeareth, shall not fail to raise wonderful tragedies. She will not be served by those who bear any good will to England: some quarrel shall be picked with them, not directly for religion at first, but when the accusation for *heresy* would be odious, men must be charged with *treason*. The like of this, in that realm, I think, hath been seen in Queen Mary's days; a few number thus disgraced, dispatched, or dispersed, the rest will be an easy prey, and then may the butchery of Boner plainly begin." This letter has been said plainly to shew a confederacy to disturb the government. Not so, if Mary would but have accepted the Treaty of Edinburgh, or listened to advice which the actual state of Scotland would have justified. Randolph's letters to *Cecil* have been also adduced in proof of an actual conspiracy, not only to intercept, but imprison her, that the government might fall into the hands of Murray, Morton, &c. "I have shewn your Honor's letter unto the Lord James, Lord Morton, and Lethington: they wish, *as your Honour doth*, that she (Mary) might be *stayed yet for a space*; and if it were not for their *obedience* sake, some of them care not though they never saw her face. They have need to look to themselves, for their danger is great." To obviate that danger, not by totally preventing her return, but delaying it, to afford time for explanation, could not be unreasonable. There are, however, other passages in Lethington's letter, cited above, which should not be passed over, as they too generally seem to be by the advocates of Mary. "I make not this discourse as our meaning to debar her Majesty from her kingdom, or that we would wish she should *never* come home (for that were the part of an unnatural subject), but rather desiring such things as be necessary so to be provided for in the mean time, that neither she, by following the wicked device of God's enemies, to lose the hearts of her subjects, neither yet so many as tender the glory of God and liberties of their native country, to be the sons of death. I assure you this whole realm is in a miserable case: if the Queen, our Sovereign, come *shortly* home, the dangers be evident

and many; and if she shall *not* come, it is *not without great peril*—her *absence* to us is most *pernicious*; thus, whether she come or not, we are in a great strait.” In a letter to be seen in *Haynes*, 369, from Lethington to *Cecil*, and written only ten days before the Queen’s arrival, expressing his fears that the intercourse between the two countries might be put an end to by Mary, he writes, “I can never change opinion that this intelligence (intercourse) can never be put in securitie, oneless the Queen my Sovarayn, by some meanes, may be perswaded to enter into it.” And that such means should be resorted to with as little delay as possible, temporizing being greatly dangerous to the Reformists, he reminds him of the Latin proverb, *multa cadunt inter calicem supremaque labra*, and of the philosopher’s engagement to make a mule speak to please his Emperor, while nothing was more likely than that before the time run out, the mule, or the philosopher, or the Emperor might die. It is not improbable that the predicament into which they might be brought by Mary’s sudden return from the Continent, should any thing befall Francis, was foreseen when the first Confederation took place. It being at that time made one of the leading articles of the agreement, that Elizabeth should take into her protection the realm of Scotland (the Duke of Chatelherault being declared heir apparent thereof by the Scottish Parliament), only for the preservation of the same (the nobility and subjects thereof), in their old freedoms and liberties, from conquest by the French, as a Christian realm in the profession of the true religion, during the time that the marriage betwixt the Queen of Scots and the French King shall continue, and *one* year after,\* or “until further order may be had betwixt both the realms for peace and concord.” As the Treaty of Edinburgh was subsequent to this, it was reasonable to offer it as the basis of a fresh agreement between the countries on the death of Francis II. It is very fairly to be concluded, that Mary’s Scottish subjects, not excepting the Congregationists, were loyal in their hearts, and that if she would but have consented to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh, England had no design to shake their loyalty or injure their Sovereign. And yet it has been unjustly, rudely, and very calumniously asserted, as a case scarcely admitting of dispute, that if she could have been intercepted by Elizabeth on her way from France, to Scotland, she would infallibly have been deprived of her crown, if not of her life.

\* Haynes, 253. The whole is directed against the *French*, and worth reading. See also the letter from the Queen to the Duke of Norfolk, March 19, 1559, where the scope of her proceedings is said to be to preserve, first, the kingdom of Scotland from conquest, and, secondly, England from invasion by France.



“The Queen,” says Goodall, in his usual passionate manner, “arrived safely in Scotland upon the xixth day of August, MDLXI., notwithstanding all their anxiety to intercept her; but when she came, she found that no suitable preparations had been made for her reception; because the persons who at that time took the management of affairs upon them were in hopes that she would *never* come, but fall into the hands of the English, to be MURDERED by them at *that* time,” vol. i. 174. This is the very author who, but a few pages before, speaks with the utmost resentment of certain reports against the *French Court* (or Guisian party,—see Cook on the Reformation), for having poisoned the Scottish Commissioners, a thing very much credited at the time, though Goodall speaks of this charge against *that Court* as a “vile calumny and scandalous aspersion upon persons who, *for any thing that appears*, were both *too great*, and *too good*, to have been guilty of an action so wicked and unmanly;” and yet some of these very great and good persons were afterwards concerned in the horrible massacre of St. Bartholomew, 1572 (not to mention that of Vassi, ten years before), as he must have known; and what is more to the purpose, perhaps, not many months before Mary left France, had sent Commissioners to Scotland to apprehend the Earl of Arran, presumptive heir to the crown, “with grete severite and extremity, and to bring him back to France either quicke or *dead*.” We are not seeking to vindicate the doings or state-craft of the sixteenth century, but to save our own country and countrymen from the odium of charges manifestly partial, and which would apply, if not in a greater degree, at least equally, to others. After all, had such murderous purposes been really entertained, what could have been easier than to have *said not a word about the Treaty of Edinburgh*, but to have *encouraged Mary to pass over to England and then detained her*? Such conduct would not have been more atrocious than what has been most unreasonably laid to the charge of Elizabeth and her Ministers. What Murray reported was, perhaps, the very reason of their endeavouring so earnestly to procure her ratification of the Treaty, as the only ground upon which there could be any fair expectation of a firm amity between the two kingdoms and their two Sovereigns.

Mary, after a passage rendered for ever memorable and peculiarly interesting by the pen of Brantome, who was on board the same ship, and witnessed all that passed, arrived safely, and without interruption, in her native country, to the possession of her regal inheritance, and occupation of her own dominions. It is impossible to read the account referred to without feeling deeply for the young Queen, constrained by the death of her husband, Francis II., and the ill-will or

jealousies of her mother-in-law, Catherine de Medicis, and, probably, urged by her uncles, ambitious of securing their own power in Scotland, to quit the place of her early education and youthful sovereignty, a kingdom comparatively refined, and to pass to her own gloomy, unrefined kingdom of Scotland ; we may well admire the tears she is said so feelingly to have shed when France could be no longer discerned from the deck of the ship that bore her away from all she then held dear, and when her doom was fixed, to pass into a country totally strange to her, and to rule over a divided people.\* It is absurd to attribute *all* Mary's misfortunes to the enmity and jealousy of any rival Sovereign : her destiny was dark and gloomy from the moment of her birth, if we regard only her *temporal* condition. We know that, according to her own principles, she died devoutly and heroically, and may therefore well hope, that she has long been at rest ; but that she had no hope of rest as Queen of Scotland, from the first moment of her widowhood, as the relict of Francis II. of France, it would be rash to deny. If her enemies were not her best friends (as perhaps might in some instances be shown), it is most certain, that, as to the issue of things, her friends were her worst enemies ; her mother first split upon the rock, through her near connexion with the *Guises*, and, under the same pilotage, her daughter could not be expected to escape. It was not English, but French interference, and indiscretions on her part, which we shall have to discuss hereafter, that brought on her the calamities which every sensible mind must to the end of time deplore.

It was, as we have already said, on the 19th of August, 1561,† in the tenth month of the third year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, that Mary arrived safely in her own Scottish dominions. We have seen what had been passing in France, to give umbrage to Elizabeth prior to this event, and the pains taken,

\* Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio has admirably described, after *Brantome*, the melancholy condition of Mary on her passage to Scotland :—" Elle quittoit, avec deplaisir, des oncles qui avoient pris soin de son Enfance, une nation polie et spirituelle, un climat heureux pour habiter un pays sterile, et regner sur des hommes grossiers, incultes comme leurs rochers. Les larmes de ceux qui l'avoient servie, à qui elle avoit procuré un sort si doux auprès d'elle, augmentèrent sa douleur. Lorsque son vaisseau fut en pleine mer, elle fit preparer son lit sur le tillac, afin d'appercevoir les côtes de France aussi long-temps que sa vue pourroit y atteindre : lorsqu' enfin l'eloignement les eut fait disparôître, *Adieu*, s' ecia-t-elle en pleurant, *adieu plaisant pays de France, je ne te reverrai jamais.*"

† See Turner's *Modern History of England*, reign of Elizabeth, b. ii. ch. xx, where he notices the very extraordinary differences amongst historians, in fixing the day of her arrival, beginning with Knox, who states it to have been on the 19th of July.

by the Secretary in person, to set things right, and quiet the differences in Scotland, by the Treaty of Edinburgh, and may easily therefore imagine, how much was to be apprehended from the return of this young Catholic Queen to her native dominions, just recovering as they were from a state of extraordinary excitement and confusion;\* the Protestant religion all but established, the country relieved from the presence of a domineering army of foreigners (at the very moment when they were about to be reinforced, for the conquest probably of both parts of the island), and a *foundation* laid not only for an union between the absent Sovereign and her *Protestant* subjects, but between England and Scotland.

The positive refusal of Mary to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh, though on her part a high-spirited act, and refused under the *plausible* pretence of waiting to consult her Scottish subjects and counsellors, could not fail, especially as opportunities of consulting the estates of Scotland had already been passed over,† to excite alarm and suspicion in the breasts of all who had engaged in the late revolution, and to put Elizabeth on her guard. England had taken her part in the struggle—she was decidedly on the side of the Reformists, or, I should rather say, of the *Reformation*; for, individually, the Reformists themselves could be no great favourites. In *Elizabeth's* eyes, they could not have appeared to stand quite clear of the crime of rebellion—Knox had rendered himself, by his writings and Genevan principles, quite obnoxious to her‡—Murray had no tie upon her, but as a leader of the reformed party—she had refused the hand of Arran, who stood in the right line to the throne—and if Lethington should

\* For an account of the state of Scotland, at the period of Mary's arrival, see *Robertson, McCrie's Life of Knox*, ii. 21, 22—28, &c.

† They had been assembled once or twice since the death of Francis. [*Camden.*] The same author, says, the ratification of the Treaty of Edinburgh had been promised by Mary, both under her hand, and by word of mouth. Mary's excuse was, "As for the Treaty of Edinborough, it was made in the K. my husbands Life-time, whom I was to obey in all things, as in duty I ought; whereas he deferred the confirmation thereof, let the blame lie upon him, and not upon me."—51, 52.

‡ See Cook on the Treaty of Berwick, history of the Reformation in Scotland, 1560: he particularly notices the fact, that the Lords of the Congregation, in negotiating with Elizabeth, were very careful to insert the most solemn and explicit declarations of their loyalty to their Queen, "It being probable," he adds, "that without assurances upon this point, Elizabeth would have refused to extend to them her support;" and he refers to *Knox's History of the Treaty*, to prove that *he* was not hostile to monarchical government, or a fomenter of sedition.—Vol. ii. 254, 255.



appear to have gained her confidence, it could only be on account of his talents, and what Cecil oddly enough calls his *honesty*, but which, in fact, was his steadiness to the cause of the Reformation, and opposition to French influence. The Treaty of Edinburgh seemed to have accomplished three great points:—the recognition, on the parts of the French and Scots, of Elizabeth's title; security for the Reformists, and for the liberties of Scotland; and a wholesome check upon all foreign influence, as inimical to the independence and true interests of both countries.

We have already observed that every grace, virtue, or accomplishment Mary possessed, must, in the natural course of things, have operated *against* her in the mind of Elizabeth. Authors have dwelt largely upon her youth at this time, being only nineteen; but Elizabeth herself was *under thirty*,—an age when, without such inordinate vanity as has been imputed to the English Sovereign, any woman may be allowed to consider herself to be in the prime of life. In the struggle between these two great rivals, Mary lost her life, and Elizabeth her character. The former will never want friends and advocates; but we feel bound to declare, that Elizabeth's enemies appear to us to have, in many instances, expected more from her, than is consistent with the most common failings and infirmities of human nature. It has been observed, that she was often more than man, and sometimes less than woman; but, to say the truth, we incline to think she must have been *more than woman*, we will not say, to *love*, but *almost not to hate Mary*; for the latter, with manners much more soft and amiable, had yet a spirit equal to her own, and pretensions to the English throne most royal and respectable. We all know the character of Elizabeth, as a Princess of exalted spirit, and great personal vanity. Let us then compare the character of Mary, as it is drawn by her rude, but learned, advocate *Whitaker*, and from thence judge, how impossible it must have been for two such women cordially to love each other, or, indeed, not to be at *variance*, under the trying circumstances in which they were severally placed; a *variance* having never less than the dethronement of each other to keep it alive; for the longer Mary sat on the Scottish throne, the more jealous she became of Elizabeth, and had she ever become despotic there, there can be little doubt but that, with the aid of the French, she would have done what she could to obtain possession of both crowns. And we should also bear in mind that, according to the spirit, temper, and practice of those sad times, whenever a crown was in competition, life was in danger. Mary fell, and fell so as to be ever since universally commiserated, and

almost *canonized*,\* as entirely the *victim* of Elizabeth's passions. The constant and incessant danger of Elizabeth's falling all the while, is almost as invariably overlooked; and the very unpleasant necessity to which her Ministers were often driven, of intriguing against intrigue, to save her, sadly underrated—what *did* happen, all know; what did *not* happen, is seldom taken into consideration. It is not our business to defend, disguise, or palliate what came to pass, but to find out, if we can, *how* it came to pass, in regard to which many things appear to have been overlooked, suppressed, distorted, or never sufficiently brought forward: but to return—

When Mary quitted France to rule her own dominions, not merely contiguous to those of Elizabeth, but forming with them *one island*, it must be allowed that she possessed every possible advantage against the latter, if she should be able to establish herself there, to the utmost extent of her own natural wishes and desires, of the views and expectations of her foreign natural relatives, and of the Romish party in general. It was impossible to suppose she could be *friendly* to the *Reformation*, either in Scotland or England: it was impossible, on this very account, that she should feel no resentment against those who had, with

\* Of this we could scarcely adduce a greater proof, than in the following passage from Goodall's preface, considering that some of the gravest writers, and most accurate historians, have not scrupled to assert, that there can be no reasonable cause to doubt that "she was a bad woman, and a bad Queen."—See *Biog. Brit.* art. *Buchanan*, note 5. We do not wish to injure *her* credit by what we cite, but to uphold the injured credit of others. Mr. Goodall then has ventured to introduce the following account of Mary into the preface of his well-known Examination. We are persuaded Mary herself, if she could have been alive to read it, would have been tempted to cry out, "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis."

"For whatever has been said to the disparagement of that Princess, or whoever said it, signifies nothing; for MARY, Queen of Scots, so far excelled all other Sovereign Princes who ever yet appeared on the face of the earth, that, as if she had not been of mortal nature, all the acts and contrivances of her numerous and malicious enemies have not availed to fix upon her one crime, shall I say, nay, not one single foible, either while on the throne, or in the jail, from her cradle to her grave, unless the want of omniscience, or omnipotence, shall be reckoned in her a defect. This is the very truth; and this can and shall be made manifest, to the admiration and satisfaction of all good men, and to the shame and confusion of all others, who shall ever, in time coming, dare to gainsay." It may be judged from this, how invidious a task we have undertaken, in the face of such a warning; for we must *question* some parts of the above high-flown panegyric, not as the willing adversaries of Mary, but as the faithful biographers of that great man, to whose hands were committed the defence of Elizabeth, of the Protestant Church, and probably the whole island of Great Britain from foreign dominion and renewed Papal tyranny.

arms in their hands, not only resisted, but overthrown the influence of her mother's family, and in so doing, courted, and received, the support of her great *rival* Elizabeth (for such she was by the mere assumption of the crown of England), whom she had been taught to regard as an illegitimate pretender to royalty, an usurper of the third throne to which she herself seemed to be called by her birth and descent ; and, with these feelings, which we may well conceive to be too strong to be so easily compromised, as some have pretended, she seemed to have every personal accomplishment necessary to carry into execution all her plans against Elizabeth, and the Protestant party, in her own country. *Whitaker's* account of her then is as follows: "She was young, beautiful, and accomplished—she had already sat upon the throne of France ; she there became the centre of a large circle ; she was the peculiar ornament of one of the politest Courts of Europe, but her soul was superior even to such a state of admiration as this. This had charms to gratify the generality of female minds, to the utmost extent of their wishes. Mary's ambition was of a more exalted kind. She wished to appear as a woman of intellect, and to be considered as a woman of taste. The strength of her talents fitted her well for the one: the high polish which had been given them, calculated her eminently for the other. She therefore shone equally in the drawing-room and the closet, in the necessary formalities of state, and in the mental intercourses of life, and, super-added to all these qualities, she had, what is scarcely ever united with them, *a native firmness of resolution.*"

To those who understand the common frailties and infirmities of human nature, it will surely appear that this extraordinary woman must have been as a thorn in the side of Elizabeth, the most sharp and piercing that could well be imagined ; but in addition to all these personal advantages, when placed in competition with the high-spirited, talented, and vain Elizabeth, it may be added, that, politically speaking, beyond the confines of the British island, Elizabeth was almost destitute of friends, or where she had any, they formed only a minority ; while Mary, on the score of *religion*, must have had, on her side, all the Catholics of Europe, not excepting those of England itself, as she herself had intimated to Throckmorton. Elizabeth having, ultimately, and, as it is alleged to this day, cruelly prevailed over her interesting competitor, it seems to have been too generally supposed, that the former possessed a superiority that rendered Mary an *easy* prey, and that the *snares* that were laid, were all on one side ; that, in fact, it was altogether a contest between craft and *innocence*, pride and *humility*, power and *weakness*, manly hardihood and *feminine softness*.



We confess the course of our investigations has brought us to a very different conclusion. To say the least, we think there were, on both sides, as far as the two Queens were concerned, frequent deception and much pride, and on neither side any weakness of mind or understanding, or any want of manly fortitude; and that the one who escaped, only escaped by affording no sufficient opportunities to the adverse party. If the victory were not altogether honestly or creditably gained, which we should be sorry to be expected to prove, yet we are very much inclined to think it was fully as much so as would have been the case under the other alternative. If we were even to go so far, as in the very outset of this horrible contest, for the outset or commencement requires as great consideration as the end, to grant that, at the least, a *judicial* or *forensic murder* was ultimately committed, we expect to have no difficulty to shew that, on the other side, murder was *escaped*, and only very narrowly escaped, in a variety of instances.

On Mary's arrival in Scotland, she acted so contrary to what might have been expected, that it would be scarcely possible to acquit her of much art and subtlety; or, at the least, of that dissembling policy which seemed to pervade Europe. She took into her confidence, to all appearance, one of the prime leaders of the Reformed party, a supposed pretender to her crown, and the very person against whom she had been most cautioned by Leslie, the envoy of her Catholic subjects. This was no less than the Prior of St. Andrew's, the Lord James Stuart, her natural brother. It could not have happened by the advice of her relatives of Lorrain, except as a *blind* to throw the Reformists off their guard, leave no immediate opening to Elizabeth to interfere, and thereby gain time for future better opportunities to pursue her own will.

How consistent this is with the view taken of the matter by the author of the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth (after Rapin) is very evident from the following passage: "The haughtiness with which Mary talked to the English Ambassador before she left France, was not only unsuitable to her present circumstances, but contrary to her measures, and the projects she had formed with her uncles. Whilst Francis II. was alive, these Princes believed that the forces of France would be sufficient to subdue Scotland, under pretence of extirpating heresy; and afterwards, in conjunction with the Scottish troops, it would be easy to enter England, and, with the assistance of the English Catholics, dethrone Elizabeth. But the war they had excited in Scotland taking a very different turn from what they had expected, and the death of

Francis following immediately upon it, they found that other measures were to be taken, and the execution of their project deferred for some time. They therefore advised the Queen, their niece, voluntarily to quit the title of Queen of England, to return into Scotland, to enter if possible into a strict friendship with Elizabeth, to endeavour to be declared her presumptive heir, and under colour of that correspondence to form a party in England, where was no want of malecontents to be serviceable on occasion. The whole course of this history shews this to have been Mary's plan." We would not deny to Mary or her friends the *right of dissembling*, as *well as others*, in such an *age of state-craft*, and concealed designs; and we must admire the able manner in which, at that early age, she so conducted herself as in no small degree to accomplish the purposes intended. The Protestant Lords were apparently thrown off their guard, Elizabeth quieted, and time gained, while her uncles were too busy in France to help her, had she thrown off the mask too soon; we shall transcribe Melvil's account of the state of things on Mary's first coming over: "Her Majesty's returning was gladly welcomed by the whole subjects. For at first, following the counsel of her friends, she behaved herself humanely to them all, committing the chief handling of her affairs unto her brother, the Prior of St. Andrew's, who afterwards she made Earl of Murray, and to the Secretary Lidington, as meetest both to hold the country at her devotion, and also to beget a strict friendship between her Majesty and the Queen of England. For my Lord Murray had great credit with my Lord Robert Dudley, who was afterward made Earl of Leicester; and the Secretary Lidington had great credit with the Secretary *Cecil*, so that these four made a strict and sisterly friendship between the two Queens and their countries; so that there appeared outwardly no more difference but that the Queen of England was the elder sister, and the Queen of Scotland the younger, whom the Queen of England promised to declare the second person according to her good behaviour; so that letters and correspondence passed weekly between them: and at first there appeared nothing more desired by either of them, than that they might see one another, by a meeting at a convenient place, whereby they might also declare their hearty and loving minds to each other: for our Queen was so nettled with the hard usage she had met with from the Queen Mother of France, who had likewise hardly used all her friends of the house of Guise, that she was the more earnest to make friends with her, and with such whom she knew that Queen liked worst."

In many particulars this seems to be a pretty true account; that is, as to the *outward* agreement and familiarity of the two Queens, though oddly enough referred by Melvil to Mary's dislike to a third Queen, the celebrated Catherine de Medicis. In the meanwhile there was one in Scotland who seems to have been not deluded by any of these outward courtesies and pretended friendships, but to have been entirely suspicious of them from the beginning.\* On the 7th of October, 1561, we find him (Knox) writing his mind pretty freely to Cecil, and in a style of remonstrance almost against the Secretary himself, for being too ready to trust Mary's attentions to the Reformists.† We can only extract a few passages. "That our Queen shall be *allured* by any such meanes as we yit use, is altogidther contrary to my judgment; for now she feareth not to sett furth Proclamations contrary to those that command hoormongers, adulterars, and idolators to be punished, according to the *former* and *established* reformation. The *Papists* I grant blowe the belloss, but the faintness of some, flattery of others, and corrupt affections of such as ought to withstand such attemptes, are like shortly to destroy the face of that building, which God by his power *had* founded amongs us. This I write from the dolor of heart. Some of no small estimation have said with oppen mouth, The Queen neyther is, neyther *shall be* of our opinion; and in very deed hir hole proceedings do declayr that the *Cardinalle's* lessons are so deaplie printed in hir hart, that the substance and the qualitie are like to perish together. I wold be glad to be deceived, but I fear I shall not. In communication with her I espyed such craft, as I have not found in such aige—since hath the Court been

\* We cannot help thinking that Knox's *suspitions* were correct. We can never bring ourselves to believe that a true Romanist or Catholic (to use the more common term) can be *tolerant* as to other modes of faith. It must be inconsistent with their sworn obedience and submission to an infallible judge. And yet Mary, by her first appointments on her return to Scotland, has the credit given her of tolerant principles beyond all bounds. "Elle fut," says Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, "la seule en Europe qui donna le grand exemple de la tolerance. Convaincu de sa religion, elle n'ordonna point à ses sujets de penser comme elle, et n'exiga de leur complaisance que la permission de suivre le culte approuvé par sa raison."—She thinks that the opposition of the Protestants, "Fit perdre aux écossois le plus beau Règne qu' ils eussent pu voir depuis l' origine de la monarchie."

† This may, I think, be concluded from the beginning of his letter. "If God had not so often (right worshipfull) trapped the men of most singular experience in there owen wisdome, when thei have begun mor to credit there owen ymaginations, than the will of God manifestly revealed, I wold have judged your counsill most holsome."



dead to me, and I to it.”—In the end he complains particularly of the Lord James and Lethington.\*

Lethington, on the very same day, Oct. 7, 1561, wrote himself to *Cecil*, a very sensible letter, in defence of the Queen of Scots’ title to the crown of England after Elizabeth, and as it appears from Lord Burghley’s Notes, that he had been at the English Court in the preceding month† (sent thither by Mary), the letter is rather to be regarded as a continuation of the communications he had held with the Secretary (and indeed with the Queen herself) at that time—in this letter he gives the following description of Mary: “I find in the Quene, my maistress, a good disposition to quietness; but I see therewithal joynd a carefull regard to her owne estate, and soche a *courage* as wilbe loth to forego her ryght;” and again, “The Quene, my Maistress, is descended of the blood off England, and so off the race off the Lyon on both sydes; I fear she cold rather be content to haserd all (soche is her *courage*) than receive that dishonour to forego her ryght.” He makes an apt allusion to the case of Henry VIII. and James V., as related in our first Volume. “I have been, by many who lived in those days, credibly informed, that yf the two Kyngs had met at Yorke, as was ones thought, Kyng Henry was fully determined to limit the succession of his Crowne to our Soverayne his Nevew, which be like may serve her Hyghness for a precedent; and if he being irritat for the breache off that appoynt-

\* We are aware that this is judged to be a very harsh and severe interpretation of Mary’s purposes. Many friends to the Reformation in Scotland are willing to acquit her of all duplicity, except on the score of religion. See *Cook*, vol. iii. 62, 63. And we ourselves are certainly not disposed to accuse her of any further dissimulation at *this* time, than is to be referred to the contradiction between her principles and her actions—her foreign relations, and her Scottish Ministry—certain it is, that, at all events, she tempered her Catholic zeal so discreetly, that if Knox were right, the ablest men in both kingdoms were likely to become her *dupes*, as his letter seems to shew; for he certainly includes *Cecil* himself in the number of those whom God appeared to have “trapped in their own wisdom,” and probably through too great a reliance on Lord James and Lethington, and a too fond expectation of bringing Mary in time to abandon the Romish religion by their Scottish and English allurements. Mary, on her return to Scotland, stood much in the situation of her mother, who, a few years before, had been advised *by her family* to “tolerate for a time, till *they* should overcome their difficulties in France, and take order accordingly.”—*Forbes*. “*Butomcourt*,” says Throckmorton, in a letter to Cecil, dated July 26, 1559, “which I think passed through to England, had in charge to will the Queen Dowager of Scotland to conform herself to the Scots proceedings in religion, and to *dissemble* with them, supposing that to be the best means to work their purposes.”—i. p. 183.

† Sept. 9, 1561. “Lyddyngton came from the Scots’ Queen into England.”

ment, did any thing prejudiciall to his Nevew, what equite was in it you may judge." In another letter to Cecil, Dec. 15, 1561, when trying to arrange a meeting of the two Queens, he expresses a desire to know first what he (Cecil) judged of the result of the meeting; "For," says he, "to enter in so just a demand, and find in the end a repulse, it wold so sore offend her, being of such a *courage* and *stomach*, as she is, that I wold be most unwilling to procure the begynning, oneless I loked for a good success." Here, then, we have two accounts of Mary, likely, above everything, to strike the mind of *Cecil*. First, The testimony of Knox to her *Guisian* principles,\* creditable to herself as principles of religious and family feeling, but highly dangerous to the Reformation in Scotland and England; and the testimony of Lethington to her courage in maintaining her rights, which Cecil must have known she could scarcely fail, according to the very same religious and family feelings, to regard as actually invaded, by Elizabeth's occupation of the English throne; and this *added* to the injury she was taught to think she had suffered through Henry's resentment against her father.

We need not stop to consider the characters of these informants, upon which it is vain to think the world, in general, will ever be agreed; the substance of the information is all we have to look to at present, as it regards *Cecil*. He had a clue given him, as to the principles and character of Mary, which, whether true or false, just or unjust, bore so immediately upon the safety of the Reformed Church, and Elizabeth's right to the throne, that as long as they should be the

\* It is very remarkable, that in consequence of her kind reception in France of her natural brother, the Lord James, and of her calling him to the government, on her return to Scotland, it has been concluded by an eminent foreigner (*Mademoiselle de Keralio*) that Mary was quite prepared to overlook all that had passed in favour of the Reformation in Scotland, not to retard its progress, and actually to abandon the bigoted principles of her family. That in consequence of some advice her *dying mother* had bequeathed to her, in reference to her own harsh government in her latter days, Mary had resolved to adopt a system of government "tout opposé a celui des GUISE." But if we compare dates, Mary could scarcely be sincere in her apparent forgiveness of her brother, who left her in May to return to Scotland; and yet in July, in her very memorable discourse with Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, she talked as freely as possible of her *disobedient* and *rebellious* subjects in Scotland, severely taunting Elizabeth for preferring *their* friendship to hers. "Sans doute c'est pour mes sujets *rebelles* qu'elle conserve son amitié, elle fait plus de cas d'eux que de moi." This may also serve to shew, how important to the Protestants in Scotland her ratification of the Treaty of Edinburgh, previous to her embarkation, must have appeared.

paramount objects of his care and attention, he could not be discharged from the obligation of seriously attending to it.

It is the observation of a sensible writer, that no one could be more tender on the subject of her right to the crown, than Elizabeth; that she never failed to resent every attack that was made upon this, from whatever quarter it came; and although several historians have amused their readers with accounts of her ambition to be thought more beautiful and accomplished than the Queen of Scots, she was, in the estimation of the author referred to, always more jealous of Mary as a competitor for the crown, than as a rival in personal charms. Of this none could be more aware than Cecil; but let the grounds of their rivalry be what they might, that he was, at this time, *averse from cementing* (if it could be accomplished) the bonds of *amity* and *friendship* between the two countries, and the two Queens, seems plainly contradicted by another letter of Lethington's, to be soon noticed.

In the mean while, every attention was paid to the defence of the kingdom, against the projects of foreign enemies, who abounded in all the states of Europe; for Philip of Spain was against England, whenever France appeared unlikely to form an union of the two kingdoms. Elizabeth, therefore, ordered all her northern forts and castles to be repaired, kept a good fleet in constant readiness, as her surest bulwark, increased the pay of the army, and that she might be the less dependent on foreign countries for a supply of gunpowder, caused it to be made at home, while the bowels of the earth were ransacked for the furnishing of all useful metals.

Of the just grounds of *Knox's* alarm, as far as concerned the *Reformation*, there can be no doubt; whatever had been accomplished towards its establishment before the return of Mary, her reluctance, or rather positive refusal to ratify what had passed, was sufficient to excite great *distrust* in a mind of much less acute feelings than that of Knox; but with all her temporizing at first, and which appears undoubtedly to have beguiled many of the friends of the Reformation, she soon adopted some measures which, in Knox's eyes, could not fail to betoken a strong disposition to annul what had passed in favour of Protestantism; in one week after her return (that is, on the first Sabbath), she celebrated a High Mass at the chapel of Holyrood House, in defiance of the prohibition of the late Parliament. We cannot *lament*, that the strong popular *resentment* excited by this act of *religion* on the Queen's part, was checked and appeased by the interference of



some of the leading men among the Protestants, particularly Murray\* and Lethington; but we must agree with Knox, that it spake volumes against the progress of the *Reformation*, or the ratification of what had been achieved, in favour of the Protestant Church. “One Mass,”† said he, in a Sermon on the following Sabbath, “is more fearfull to me, than if ten thousand armed enemies wer landed in any parte of the realme, of purpose to suppress the hole religion.” Knox always felt strongly, but his foresight is not to be disputed; very serious consequences were to be apprehended from this one mass, as betokening the Queen’s fixed resolution, in contempt as it were of all that had passed, to adhere to the Roman Catholic worship.

Her spirit may be admired, and her steady adherence to the religion of her forefathers respected, but it was impossible for those who had struggled hard for the deliverance of Scotland from the yoke of Papal bondage to suppose, that she was not under the control of her foreign relatives, actuated by the “lessons,” as Knox calls them, of her uncles of Lorraine, and prepared to go all lengths in restoring the Catholic Religion. Under these circumstances, one mass, in defiance of the decrees of a Protestant Parliament, left scarcely any hope to the Reformists, in regard to their newly arrived Sovereign. As her manners were fascinating, Knox plainly saw that many were disposed to yield to the witchcraft of her smiles, regardless of the consequences to religion: at first, with all his severity of manners, and republican principles,‡ he appears himself

\* Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio is willing to give Murray the credit of having seen the impropriety and indecency of preventing the Queen’s performing the rites of her own religion, before he went to France upon commission, to invite her return. Her words are these: “Son frère, le lord James, prieur de Sainte André, lui fut envoyé par les réformés; mais, avant son depart, on lui fit promettre, qu’au retour de la Reine en Ecosse, il empêcheroit qu’elle fit celebrer la messe en public, ou même en particulier. Le lord James promit d’empêcher le retablissement de la religion Catholique; mais il dit et pensa peut-etre qu’il étoit juste de laisser à la Reine la liberté de faire celebrer le sacrifice de la messe dans son propre palais.”

† Cook iii. 69, 70.

‡ As to the roughness of Knox’s manners, much is to be found in extenuation of it in Dr. McCrie’s able Life of that spirited Reformer, and many fair specimens are adduced of the intemperate language of many of his contemporaries, to mark the general spirit of the times, vol. i. note W. See also vol. ii. notes Q. S. and T.; and, indeed, we must observe, that the Popish writers have no great right to blame him in this respect. If Knox rudely called Mary a *Jezebel*, to the great offence of both Protestants and Papists, it should be recollected that *Peto*, afterwards Cardinal,

to have been almost beguiled ; but the infatuation did not last long ; the proceedings of the first Parliament soon again opened his eyes, and convinced him that every thing was lost, unless he should, with the utmost stress of religious feeling, openly protest against the proceedings of the Court. In this he seems to have acted with a very extraordinary firmness, and though he will never be forgiven, on the score of sensibility, for having drawn tears from the eyes of his young and beautiful Sovereign, yet it may be questioned, whether the soundest patriot could have done more for the real welfare of his country, or for the conversion of his Sovereign from the corruption of a false religion to the purer doctrines of a Reformed Church. The contrast to Mary, indeed, must have been great ; for the austerities of the Genevan discipline, engrafted on the unrefined manners of her Scottish subjects, must certainly have had something revolting in them, and we are at no loss to account for the complaints which Knox himself has recorded of the young French Queen, when she arrived amongst the *Calvinists* of her native dominions. “ Her comene talk,” says he, “ was in *secrete*, that sche saw nothing in Scotland bot *gravity*, quilk repugned altogidder

had, not long before, called Henry VIII. an *Ahab*; not rudely only, but with a savage indelicacy considering the occasion. Dr. McCrie, however, observes generally, upon the forcible style of the early Reformers in their sermons : “ It is better to be awakened with rudeness, or even by a false alarm, than to be allowed to sleep on in the midst of danger.”—vol. ii. 112. But, *Randolph* and *Cecil* himself have been accused of glorying in the rudenesses of Knox, as furthering their purposes against Mary ; and yet Randolph, in one of his letters to Cecil, observes, “ as to Mr. Knox, I commend better the success of his doings and preachings, than the *manner* thereof ;” and of the reformed preachers generally, he says, “ to be plain with you, they are as wilful as unlearned, which I lament ;” and again of Knox, “ our preacher is more vehement than discreet or learned ;”—“ Knox on Sunday last gave the cross and the candle such a wipe, that those as wise and learned as himself wished him to have held his peace.”—We have spoken of his rude likening of Mary to Jezebel, and compared it with the language of a Cardinal in calling Henry VIII. an *Ahab* ; but, in the refined and Catholic kingdom of France, the language of the pulpit, at the very same period, was in no degree less vituperative, as the following story may serve to shew :—A preacher of the League, having chosen for the subject of his sermon the *enormities* of Henry III. his lawful sovereign, finished his discourse in these mild and elegant terms : “ Briefly, HE” (*i. e.* Henry) “ is a Turk in head, a German in body, an Harpy in the hands, an Englishman in the Garter, a Pole in the feet, and a very Demon in soul.”—*Memoirs of the League*, vol. iii. 542. It was the violence of the preachers and clergy that first wrought upon the mind of Clement to emulate *Jéhu* and *Judith*, in the murder of the French *Holofernes* (as they did not scruple to call their King, Henry of Valois) ; and here, after all, was no difference of religion ; for, though not a Leaguer, Henry was a true Catholic.

to her nature, for she was brocht up in *joyeusitie*.\* It is to be apprehended that *Scottish joyeusitie* was, to Mary's *taste*, almost as bad as its *gravity*; on the first night after her arrival, Knox tells us, that "a company of most honest men, with instruments of music and musicians, gave their salutations at her chamber window. The melody, as she alleged, liked her well, and she willed the same to be continued some nights after with great diligence:"—a strong proof, certainly, of her great good nature and polite manners; for, what does her more refined French attendant *Brantome* say of this honest company of melodists? "And what was worse, in the evening, at the Abbey of Edinburgh, when she wished to lie down, there came 5 or 600 ragamuffins of the city, saluting her with some wretched fiddles and little rebecks, which abound in this country, and began singing Psalms as badly and discordantly as could be. Heh! what music! and what a repose for her night!"

But we must leave Scotland for a time, to see what was passing at home, where the state of the Church was as much and as constantly an object of care and attention to the Secretary, as the state of the nation at large, in its civil and political relations. The Bench of Bishops was now almost fully supplied with men who, like the Secretary, had seen much of the struggles of the two or three last reigns, and well knew, therefore, in how critical a state they stood with regard to the credit and stability of the restored Protestant Church. It has been well observed, that, in comparison with Mary's Bishops, "they were not so well learned in *canon* law, in matters of *contention* about worldly controversies, in bearing of temporal office and authority, in income, courtly behaviour, and worldly pomp, as were those bishops; yet, in all kinds of learning, manners, and qualities, by St. Paul, in the office of a bishop required, there were found as many learned bishops, and as able and willing to do the duty of good and godly bishops [*per se et non per alium*] as ever were among the Papists, or in England, since the first bishops were created in it;" and with regard to the new ministry, the same observer adds, that "he trusted likewise, that the clergy next under the bishops should not be found one whit inferior in learning, nor honesty of life, to theirs."

This, then, was really a great change, for the nation stood marvellously in need, not only of a reformation in *religion*, commonly so called, but of *manners*, *zeal*, and *principles*. Many of the new Bishops found their sees in dreadful disorder, and it required no ordinary judgment to discern the best mode of

\* *Histoire*, p. 174.



bringing them into order. In what manner these things were conducted must be sought, by those who are interested in the regular and progressive establishment of our Protestant Church, in the volumes of that eminent ecclesiastical historian, Strype; the following anecdote may perhaps deserve to be noticed, as an early instance of the Secretary's concern for the clergy, and of his ready attention to all reasonable complaints:

“ In April, Richard *Cheney*, a learned man, made a complaint to Secretary CECIL, concerning a wrong sustained by the late royal visitation. He was incumbent of a parish, called Halford, in Warwickshire, of ten pounds per annum [in the King's books as it seems]; whereof he allowed his priest ten pounds per annum, and he lived on the rest (as he wrote), that is, on the remainder, which was little more. But being in that visitation absent from his said living, charitably preaching about in the country, in the great want of preachers at this time; the harvest being, as he said, great, but the labourers few, yea very few; whether it were his absence or something else, which the visitors took notice of, or offence at, but he was worse by forty pounds since the Queen came in, than he was before. This man, being Archdeacon of Hereford under King Edward, was one of the Convocation in the first year of Queen Mary; and, with five more,\* did boldly dispute in that synod against transubstantiation, with the learnedest men there that held that doctrine. In his younger days he was often at Court, I suppose a preacher there; but now in his age chose a country retirement. ‘I began first in my youth,’ said he, in a letter to the Secretary, ‘at the Court, but I intend to make an end, in my age, at the cart, at my circumcised benefice.’—He was a good Grecian, and affected the true, though new way of pronouncing it, which Mr. *Cheke*, the Greek Lecturer first set on foot in Cambridge;† he had friends which offered to procure him a bishoprick, or a prebend in Westminster; but he declined both, affecting rather a private life. He was lately called up to preach at Court, where CECIL afterwards spying him, went, after his courteous way, towards him, offering him his hand. This gave Mr. *Cheney* a fair encouragement to write to him, and to let him know what damage he had lately sustained in his poor preferment; and so writ to him in April, after a facetious style,‡ which was his way, hinting therein his wrong, and present poor estate,—but this complaint of his made such an impression upon *Cecil's* tender heart, that he

\* See vol. i. p. 577.

† See vol. i. p. 55.

‡ In this letter is the story related referred to, vol. i. p. 55.

sent Cheney's letter to the Archbishop, and these kind words endorsed upon it, 'I beseech your Grace, consider of this poor man's merry, simple request, indeed it is not his shame to lack : and, therefore, for God's sake, let him be helped. I cannot with leisure do for him : but whatsoever your Grace will devise for me to do, I will not forbear. Your Grace's at commandment,

' W. CECIL.'

"The same year, Eton College wanting a Provost, the Archbishop put the Secretary in mind to recommend him to the Queen for that preferment, styling him, 'a good, grave, priestly man,' but failing of that, he was preferred the next year to the bishoprick of Gloucester."\*

The author first cited gives the following account, under the year 1561, of the progress of the Reformation to this time :—

"And now we may look back, and observe, what good progress was already made in the reformation of religion. The dioceses were supplied with learned, pious, Protestant Bishops ; images were removed out of the Churches ; the Common Prayers celebrated in the English tongue ; the sacrament of the Lord's Supper administered to the people in both kinds ; mass and transubstantiation exploded ; the Pope's pretended jurisdiction in England rejected ; sound Articles of Christian faith framed, and professed by the Clergy ; homilies, that is, plain, practical sermons, set forth, to be read to the people, where preaching could not be had. So that the Church of England was reduced to the same good state wherein it was at the latter years of King Edward, as described by Bishop Ridley, a little before his death."†

It was in the summer of this year, that we first read of the Queen's visiting the Secretary at his own house ; a compliment she always paid her subjects with such form and ceremony, as was calculated indeed to confer no small distinction, but often greatly to the trouble and expense of her hosts. We shall have much more to say hereafter of the repeated honours of this kind conferred upon Lord Burghley, all calculated to shew the high estimation in which he was constantly held by a Sovereign of most singular discernment and penetration ; and indeed, to mark this the more strongly, when not visited himself, he was generally selected to accompany her upon other visits, as a counsellor, whose

\* *Strype's Annals*, i. 373, 4. Cheney after all was a very singular and eccentric character, though, in the main, amiable.—See more of him, *Annals*, i. ch. xxv.

† In the course of this year, the celebrated reformer, Peter Martyr, Divinity Professor at Oxford in the reign of Edward, was invited to return to England, which he civilly declined.

presence, and consequently whose advice, was in all instances, and at all times, necessary to her. On the 10th of July, her Majesty went in great state to the Mint; which, much to her credit, had been employed in preparing a coinage of the true standard for general circulation; a measure which the Secretary had so much at heart, as apparently to have applied his mind anxiously to the subject from the first moment of her accession, as we have shewn elsewhere. After this, accompanied by trumpeters, heralds, gentlemen-pensioners, and a large retinue of lords and ladies (Lord Hunsdon, her cousin, in due form bearing the sword of state immediately before her), she repaired to the Lord North's, at the Charter House, where, we are told, she tarried till "the 13th day,\* when she took her way from thence by Clerkenwell over the fields into the Savoy, to Mr. Secretary CECIL's, where she supped. Here her Council waited on her, with many lords and knights and ladies; and great cheer made till midnight; and then her Grace rode back to the Charter House, where she slept that night."† She proceeded after this upon a progress into Essex, and the account given of her return to London marks, in no ordinary manner, the difference of times, and travelling accommodations, even in the immediate neighbourhood of the metropolis.

September 8. "The Queen, who had been in her progress, removed from Hartford Castle to Enfield. And the 22d‡ she came from Enfield to St. James's beyond Charing Cross. From Islington thither the hedges and ditches were cut down to make the next way for her; such was their gladness and affection

\* 14th, Lord Burghley's notes.

† We might doubt whether this visit was quite agreeable to the Secretary; his own note of it being as follows:

"July 14. The Queen supped at my house in the Strand, *before it was fully finished*; and she came by the fields from Christ Church."

‡ In the course of this month, it appears, from the Queen's letters to her Commissioners in the North, the Duke of Norfolk, and Earls of Oxford and Rutland, and from other papers printed in Haynes's Collection, that the King of Sweden was expected very soon to land somewhere on the English shores, being then on the seas; coming, "*determined*," as her Majesty was careful to express, "of his *own mind* to this realm to visit us." Elizabeth, it seems, had been previously rather offended with the officious and premature zeal of some of her subjects, who, in their anxiety to see her married, had circulated papers with portraits of herself and the Royal Suitor, in one print, as if already united. The Secretary was obliged to interpose, and to write to the Lord Mayor to suppress all such papers, which seemed to touch her honour, as though she had already consented to the union, "where indeed," the Secretary adds, as if from himself, "her Majesty hitherto cannot be induced (whereof we have cause to sorrow) to allow of any marriage



to her. It was night ere she came over St. Giles's in the fields." From Enfield to St. James's by Islington, could not have been more than 12 or 14 miles.

It was upon this excursion, which extended beyond Essex into Suffolk, that Elizabeth took such offence, not only at the slovenly manner in which the public services were performed, with little order or regularity, and often without the prescribed habits, but at the married state of the clergy, to which she was strangely disaffected. She caused an order to be made, dated from Ipswich, August 9, strictly prohibiting all resort of women to the lodgings of *Cathedrals* and Colleges; and the Secretary was directed to forward it to the Metropolitans of each province, and to the Universities.—*Cecil* was not well pleased to have this to do; and could not help telling Archbishop Parker, in a letter, when the order was sent to him, how much he wished it otherwise; lamenting that the Queen should entertain such strong prejudices against the marriage of priests, notwithstanding his utmost endeavours to remove them. And that in truth the present order was but an expedient to moderate matters as much as possible. But the whole letter should be transcribed, as tending to shew, according to Strype, 112, the good and cordial temper and concern of the Secretary both for the Church and University. It is dated, Smallbridge, 12 August, 1561.

"Your Grace shall understand that I have had hitherto a troublesome progress, to stay the Queen's Majesty from daily offence conceived against the clergy, by reason of the indiscreet behaviour of the Readers and Ministers, in these countries of Suffolk and Essex. Surely here be many slender ministers, and such nakedness of religion, as it overthroweth my credit. Her Majesty continueth very ill affected to the state of matrimony in the clergy. And if I were not therein very stiff, her Majesty would utterly and openly condemn and forbid it; in the end, for her satisfaction this injunction now sent to your Grace is devised; the good order thereof shall do no harm; I have devised to send it in this sort to your Grace, for your province; and to the Archbishop of York

with any manner of person." This letter was written in July of this year, and may be seen in Haynes, 368.

It is impossible, when treating of these offers of marriage, to omit to notice the celebrated Discourse of Sir Thomas Smith, to be seen in the appendix to his Life by Strype; wherein, in the form of a dialogue, he most ingeniously discusses the three curious points, whether the Queen should marry? and if so, whether a foreigner? or an Englishman?

for his, and to the Chancellors of the two Universities for their charge;\* so as it shall not be promulged to be popular. The Bishop of Norwich is blamed even of the best sort for his remissness in ordering his clergy; he winketh at Schismatics and Anabaptists, as I am informed; surely I see great variety in ministration; a surplice may not be borne here; and the ministers follow the folly of the people, calling it charity to feed their fond humour. Oh! my Lord, what shall become of this time." He next notices the commitment of Lady Catharine Grey to the Tower, for having married the Earl of Hertford, without the Queen's knowledge and consent; asks the Archbishop to recommend to him for the mastership of St. John's College, Cambridge; and concludes, "Your Grace's at commandment, W. CECIL."

It must be observed, that the Injunction issued by the Queen is confined to *Colleges* and Cathedrals, and proceeds upon the principle, that the Founders had designed them to be places wholly devoted to study, and incompatible, therefore, either with the cares of a family, or the residence of persons not occupied in study, to the dislodgment or exclusion of such as were decidedly in the view of the Founders. In regard to Colleges we may know at this time how far the Queen was right; but the case of Cathedrals was somewhat different even then, as was observed by Bishop Cox, in a long letter to the Archbishop; the prebendaries' houses being large, separate, and distinct habitations; which would be inducements to residence, if they should be allowed to marry. "There is," says his Lordship, "but one prebendary continually dwelling with his family in Ely Church. Turn him out; daws and owls may dwell there for any continual house-keeping." The letter may be seen in Strype's *Life of Parker*, Anno 1561; where may also be seen, Appendix, No. xvii., the Archbishop's own letter to the Secretary, greatly deploring the Queen's inexorable and inveterate prejudice upon this point; in an interview with whom, only the day before, he had been so severely blamed, and so rudely treated, by her Majesty, as to disturb him greatly, and which he attributed, as he tells *Cecil*, to certain persons about her, that hated true religion, and did it to subvert the gospel of Christ; he was even apprehensive, from the Queen's manner, that she

\* In Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*, lib. vii. No. xii. may be seen the Queen's letter to Sir William, as Chancellor of Cambridge, with directions to have the Injunction communicated to every College and Hall there; the letter is addressed to our "Trustye and right well-beloved Counselor, Sir William Cecil, Knt. our principall Secretarie; Master of our Court of Wards and Lyveries, and Chancellor of our Universitye of Cambridge."

would issue further injunctions in favour of Popery. "Whether the Secretary acquainted the Queen with this letter, or what success it had with her," says Collier, "does not appear."

In October of this third year of her reign, an attempt was made by proclamation to abate a great nuisance, amounting indeed to a very indecent profanation of the Lord's House. We *allude* to the custom, so often noticed in writings of that age, of resorting to the Churches, St. Paul's particularly, for the mere sake of walking and talking, hearing and telling of news, assignations of business or pleasure, and payment of money by engagement; a thing so common, that in the proclamation prohibiting such abuses in future, it was judged necessary to introduce a particular clause, to make it lawful for persons *previously* bound by any covenant or bond, to make tender or payment in the Churches according to the obligation, unless, out of respect to the proclamation, (as might be hoped and expected,) they should in the mean while otherwise agree. We may easily suppose, that in those comparatively rude times, such a concourse of persons, gathered together for such different ends and purposes, must have been likely, besides the indecency of the custom in a general point of view, to lead to disputes, affronts, quarrels, and contentions of various sorts, to the great disturbance of the peace, or open breach of the laws. The Proclamation therefore begins with the very natural complaint, that so much "outrageous and unseemly behaviour" had disgraced these meetings of the people, that it had become entirely necessary, speedily to reduce all Churches, to which such resort had been accustomed to be made, "to the godly uses for which the same were builded."\*

It may be remarked, that on the 4th of June preceding, the church of St. Paul's had suffered great damage by fire; but whether by lightning, carelessness, or the design of wicked persons, could not at the time be fully resolved. It was chiefly attributed to lightning, by which many other churches had been damaged; but Heylin informs us, that it was accounted for after, by the confession of a Plumber, on his death-bed, who owned that it proceeded from his own carelessness, in leaving a pan of coals in the steeple, when he went to dinner. It afforded ground, however, while judged to be done by lightning, for the superstitious to indulge their fancies in regard to the object of such a visitation of Providence. The *Papists* were prepared, as might be expected, to refer

\* Strype's Life of Archbishop Grindal, 83, 84. &c.



it to the *late changes in religion* ; but the Bishop of Durham having to preach there on the Sunday next following, viz. June 8th, very properly represented the ungodly profanation of the place, in times past, to be a more probable cause of God's anger ; and thereby afforded the Government a fair plea for advising her Majesty to issue the Proclamation above-mentioned ; and as the abuse had been of long-standing, it could not but redound to the credit of the Reformation to correct such disorders as speedily as possible.

Having had many things of great public importance to notice at the commencement of this year, we were obliged to defer the mention of the Secretary's appointment, in the month of January, 1560, to succeed Sir Thomas Parry, as Master of the Court of Wards, "an office of honour," says the Author of his Memoirs, "of power and profit, wherein he did as much, or more service to the Queen, than he gained credit to himself, though even in those times, when men's characters were narrowly scanned, and their conduct nicely weighed, he was allowed to have discharged that troublesome *post* with more *justice*, though with less *severity*, than any of his predecessors."\*

What the author means, by his discharging this office with more benefit to the Queen, than credit to himself, is not, that he did not deserve credit for the discharge of his duties, but that his enemies were anxious "to find him tripping in point of *Law*," because he was too busy, for their purposes, in reforming abuses, and making his underlings do *their* duty more strictly than had heretofore been the case.

In the Life, by a Domestic, as published by Mr. Peck, in his *Desiderata Curiosa*, two whole chapters are assigned to the subject before us, which besides being too long to be transcribed, may be so easily consulted in the work referred to, as to render it unnecessary to do more here than give some abstract of their contents ; it is very obvious, that, in bad hands, it was a court and office open to great abuses, and continued so, till abolished by Statute 12mo. of Charles II. When Sir William was first appointed, he found its revenues decayed, through advantages taken of the Crown, and contempt of the Court itself ; he applied himself immediately, therefore, to inquire into these abuses, and remedy them, by raising the customary fines, to the Queen's great advantage, yet so moderately, as not to oppress the subject ; he was careful in placing his Wards, "ever endeavouring," says his Memorialist, "to commit them to persons of sound religion,

\* The Court of Wards was first erected in the reign of Henry VIII., and afterwards augmented by him with the Office of Liveries ; wherefore it was styled the Court of *Wards* and *Liveries*.

preferring natural mothers, before all others, to the custody of their own children, if they were not to be touched with any notable exception. He was very particular in his orders or decrees, always giving his reasons for them, and making them so short, plain, and full, that men of the meanest capacity might understand and effect them. He would never suffer lawyers to wrangle, but would ever hold them to the point."

"The reader may conceive," says one of his encomiasts, "what I say to be so extraordinary, as to doubt whether my prejudice in his favour may not have engaged me to state his abilities as a *judge* in language somewhat raised above the truth; but they must lose all prejudice when I affirm, that, for the sake of brevity, I omit *ten* times the particulars which I might have recorded; and that we are assured, by credible authors, that whenever he sat in judgment, many persons of great quality, and some of them none of his friends, would purposely be present, that they might delight themselves with his nervous *eloquence*, and admire that brief style, wherein he delivered many things clearly and distinctly, yet in few words, unadorned with rhetorical figures, but so admirable from their significant propriety, that however his abilities were *envied* by *many*, they were *commended* by *all*."

Camden says of him, that "he managed this place (as he did all his other) very providently for the service of his Prince and the Wards, for his own profit moderately, and for the benefit and advantage of his followers and retainers beneficially; yet, without offence, and with great commendations for his integrity."

This post seems to have been so liable to abuse, that his enemies could not but suppose, that, like his predecessors, he would let no private advantage or emolument escape him; but his Domestic has shewn it to be quite otherwise; that his moderation was most exemplary, and all his profits made without any touch or blemish to his honour and honesty; as he instances indeed in several particulars.

Before we conclude our account of this year, we ought not to omit to notice the great diligence used, and chiefly under the direction of the Secretary, to strengthen the kingdom, in every practicable manner, by provision of ships, and warlike stores, augmenting the pay of the soldiers and sailors,\* repairing and

\* In consequence of this encouragement, Camden tells us, there were as many as 20,000 fighting men ready for the sea-service alone. Great attention was paid to the training of men to

enlarging the fortifications where needful, and very particularly in exploring, and rendering available to public purposes, the natural riches of the country ; thereby increasing her independence, in the most essential points, by giving her a knowledge of, and greater confidence in, her own resources. A fortunate discovery of the *lapis calaminaris*, in the course of this year, is particularly recorded, as of great importance in the preparation of *brass*, hitherto principally confined to Germany,\* whereby the ordnance was much and rapidly increased ; many great guns, both in iron and brass, being cast† without the aid of foreign materials, or foreign labour. It was about this time that gunpowder first began to be made in England. Great encouragement also was given to the agriculture of the country, by allowing corn to be exported, which brought into tillage a much larger proportion of the land than would otherwise have been cultivated, to the augmentation of the supply of many of the first necessities of life, and the profitable employment of the poorer classes. To every thing of this nature the attention of Lord Burghley seems to have been constantly directed ; there was nothing of public, or even private utility, that does not appear, from memorandums in his own hand-writing still extant, to have occupied his thoughts, while waiting only for suitable opportunities to carry the several improvements which suggested themselves fully into execution.

arms ; the nobility and gentry being eager to do their utmost to strengthen the forces and military prowess of the kingdom, by private armouries and mock skirmishes.

\* The making of brass, by means of the *lapis calaminaris*, is said to have been kept a secret in Germany for many ages.

† Though this attention was paid to the increase of the ordnance, archery was not neglected ; we find it among the instructions given to the masters of endowed schools, that the boys, in their vacant hours, should practise with their bows and arrows.



## CHAP. IV.

1562.

The Fourth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, began November 17, 1561.

*Correspondence between the two Queens on the Treaty of Edinburgh—Dangers from the Guises—Knox and Concæus on the tyranny of the Guises—Necessity of examining into the conduct of the Catholics—Projected interview of the two Queens—Elizabeth ill—Mary of Scots anxious to have her title asserted—Cecil's letter to resign the Chancellorship of Cambridge—Situation of France at the accession of Charles IX.—Massacre of Vassi—Elizabeth assists the Hugonots—Confusion of parties—Throckmorton, Smith, Leicester, &c.—Shan O'Neale—Jewel's Apology—Death of Peter Martyr.*

THE first entry under this 4th year of the Queen's reign in Lord Burghley's notes, is to the following effect :

“ Nov. 23. anno 4to Eliz. The Queen's Majesty wrote to the Queen of Scots, that she cold not like of the Scotts Queens answer made to Sir Peter Mewtas, who required to have the treaty confirmed, that was made at Edinburgh.”

Mary's answer to this letter, about six weeks afterwards, is thus also noticed : “ Jan. 5. The Queen of Scotts wrote a letter, to answer the Queen Majesty's letter, dated 23d Nov., sent before by Sir Peter Mewtas.—The Queen of Scotcs refuseth to confirm the Treaty of Edinburgh.” Mary's letter may be seen in Haynes, p. 376. addressed “ To the richt excellent, richt heich and mighty princesse, our dearest sister and cousine, the Quene of Ingland.” It contains many handsome compliments to the judgment of Elizabeth, and very frankly states the ground of her objections to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh, to be an apprehension that it might affect her *reversionary* title to the English crown ; that is, as Mary herself expresses it, “ failzeing of Elizabeth, and the lawchfull ishe of her body.” Had Mary at this time been free from all her foreign connexions, it would be impossible to object to the tenor of this letter. She had by *descent* as great a right as any to come next to Elizabeth, and the lawful issue of her body ; and ultimately, as we know, the crown descended in this right line. But though this were ever so true, yet Elizabeth's reasons for not declaring Mary

to be her next heir are certainly very plausible; after assuring her that "she would do nothing of herself to the prejudice of Mary's right to the crown of England, she observed, that the declaring her successor while she had youth and hopes of issue, might be the only means to breed discord between them; it being common to the apparent heirs to wish for the death of such as detain them from the possessions; besides such declaration might remove the good will and affections of her people from her to her successor; according to an old proverb, that many observed the rising, but few the setting sun; adding many examples of the mutability of subjects' behaviour towards their Sovereigns, according to their different circumstances of life; that as in all courts there were some persons whose loyalty and fidelity depended upon the opportunities they had to gratify their own covetous humour, so when their hopes were frustrated by the immediate Sovereign, they were apt to direct all their thoughts, wishes, and good offices, to advance the interest of the next successor, or any having pretension, whom they should esteem most answerable to their ends; and therefore she freely said, that she could never think her own life and condition safe, after she had declared her successor."

As long as Mary appeared to be a willing instrument in the hands of her foreign relatives, it was impossible with any safety to treat with her individually. The refusal on Elizabeth's part to declare the heir to her crown has subjected her to the imputation of being quite regardless of posterity, and of the dangers that might arise after her death, from a disputed succession; but Elizabeth was not to be expected to endanger herself to save posterity, and in truth there was much more at stake than any mere disputes about the descent of the crown. Mary was already a sufficient rallying point to the disappointed *Catholics* of England, as she well knew, and had not forborne to intimate to Throckmorton himself, and though it was not till long after this that the latter became dangerous to Elizabeth, and then only in consequence of the *Pope's* interference,\* yet there is no saying what might have been the issue of Elizabeth's public acknowledgment of Mary's claims to a throne, from which her father had appeared, for some reason or other, so carefully, though unjustly perhaps, to have excluded her; it was a delicate point to ask Elizabeth to proclaim the injustice of her father, at the desire of a family who would have set aside all her own claims,

\* It seems to be generally acknowledged that, for the first ten years of the Queen's reign, a great abundance of Roman Catholics frequented the churches, "without shew of misliking."—See *Collier*, ii. 436. and the Queen's instructions to Walsingham, Aug. 11. 1570.

and had actually evinced every disposition to do so.\* Cecil's† eye, in fact, was always upon this *family*. "Continue," he writes to Throckmorton, "to put the Queen's Majesty in remembrance of her perills if the *Guisians* prosper." Was there any harm in this? certainly great harm, if it proceeded from mere malignity of heart, or groundless suspicions of a family, on many accounts, of high repute and consideration, in the eye of Europe; but his views were altogether public, and his suspicions probably any thing but groundless, as regarded the safety of his sovereign, and the cause of the Reformation. This may be learned from a very important paper, to be seen in Forbes, purporting to be "a memorial, by *Cecil*, on the perils growing upon the overthrow of the prince of Condees cause." That is, in the contest he had with the *Guises*; who were constantly seeking to get the whole power of France into their own hands, and extirpate Protestantism. In his earliest instructions to Throckmorton, May 14, 1559,

\* Lethington, as we have seen, suggests the possibility of Henry having omitted the Scotch branch of the family in his will, out of *resentment* against James V., for the memorable disappointment he suffered from James's not meeting him at York, (see vol. i.) and in one of his letters he urges Cecil to consider, if it were so, the *equity* of such a proceeding; in *both* cases, therefore, Henry stands accused of an inequitable neglect, or oversight of the Scottish branch, all which Elizabeth was expected to acknowledge and confirm. The correspondence between the Secretaries upon this point is curious, tending to shew, not only that Lethington was sincerely interested for Mary, but that Cecil was exceedingly anxious, if it could have been accomplished, to promote a friendship between the two Queens; "and for that I should be sorry," Lethington writes to Cecil, Dec. 15, 1561, "that any thing shold pass betwixt their two Majesties, but that which shall directly tend to the continuance and increase of the good intelligence off late begone betwix them; knowing also that *yow* and *I* be *bothe off one mind*, to direct all our actions and credit, in the place off service which we occupy, *to that end*." And he speaks of having amply discussed the matter with Cecil, partly in letters and partly by conference &c.; but when he talks of "God having kindled in the heart of Mary a profound love for Elizabeth," or when Mary herself reminds Elizabeth of the "abundance of luif Nature had wrocht in her heart towards her," we cannot say we rely at all upon the truth or sincerity of such expressions, on either side; the ministers might be sincere in wishing to promote an amity between them, but the high-flown terms of royal or ministerial letters are only calculated to deceive. We shall always believe that Mary loved Elizabeth, no better than Elizabeth loved her. Nature must have wrought very oddly, to have produced any "abundance of love" on *either* side; yet Mary wrote in this strain to Elizabeth, without the smallest scruple or reserve.

† It might be asked, whether Mary, being herself at this time without any direct heirs, was prepared to acknowledge, in the same degree, the Hamiltons, as her successors? or whether, on the contrary, they were not formally proscribed by her relatives in France, in resentment of their siding with the Protestants?—See *Camden*, 40, 41.



he writes, "as for your doings with the family of Guise, it shall be meet to shew good countenance towards them, and if ye shall find any friendship in them, to entertain it with as good; if otherwise, ye may dissemble the same as ye see meeteth; for it is best to know them without knowledge. If any harm be meant it is to be learned *thence*; and therein may ye have best help of Scots;" but to come to the *memorial*.

"The whole regyment of the crown of Fraunce shall be in the hands of the *Guisians*; and to maynteane their faction, they will pleasure the Kyng of Spayne in all that they maye; hereuppon shall follow a complott betwixt them twoo, to advance there owne pryvat causees; the King of Spayne, to unhable the Howss of Navarr for ever from clayming the kingdom of Navarr; the Howss of Guise, to promote there nece the Quene of Scotts to the Crown of England, and for doing thereof twoo thyngs principally will be attempted: the marriadge betwyxt the Prynce of Spayne and the sayd Quene; and in this compact the realme of Irland to be gyven in a praye to the Kyng of Spayne.

"Whylest this is in work, and that the Protestants rest as beholders onely, the generall counsell shall condemn all the Protestants, and gyve the kyngdoms and dominions thereof to any other Prynce that shall invade them: in this meane tyme, all the Papists in England shal be solicited not to styrr, but to confine their faction with comfort to gather monny, and to be reddey to styrr at one instant, when some forreyn force shall be reddey to assaile this realme or Irland.

"When the matter is brought to these tearmes, that the Papists shall have the upper hand, then will it be too late to seke to withstand it: for than the matter shall be lyke a great rock of stone, that is falling downe from the top of a mountayn, which, when it is coming, no force can stey.

"Whosoever thynketh that relentyng in religion will asuage the *Guisians* aspirations, they ar farr deceyved:\* for two appetites will never be satisfyed, but with the thyng desyred. The desyre to have such a kyngdom as England and Scotland may make, unyted; and the cruell appetite of a Pope, and his adhe-

\* It is impossible that Cecil, or any others, should impute more to the *Guises* than *Bayle* has done in his *Dictionnaire Critique*, Art. *Francois de Lorrain*. See also Art. *Guise* [Claude de Lorrain], note B., where notice is taken of the caution given by Francis I. to his son, just before his death, to be on his guard against the ambition of the *Guises*: "*imprimis eum monuit*;" they are the words of *De Thou*, "*ut sibi à Guisianorum ambitione caveret, ac proinde eos publicæ rei gubernaculis ne admoveret*:" how much, notwithstanding the above caution, Francis's immediate successors suffered from the ambition of the *Guises*, need not be told.

rents, to have his authorite re-established fully, withowte any new daunger of attempt."

We are not so scantily supplied with the history of Europe, as to be unable to appreciate properly this specimen of Cecil's foresight, notwithstanding all the outcry that has been made against him and his extraordinary Sovereign, for indulging *visionary fears, and groundless apprehensions*. We are utterly astonished at the ignorance, or rather malice, that has been displayed by some much admired writers, in representing Elizabeth's life to have been altogether a life of unprovoked mischief and self-sought misery;\* of mischief to others, in the plots which she is alleged, by such writers, to have been always forming against them; and of misery to herself, through her *groundless suspicions of unintended designs* against her Crown and Government. If *Cecil's* distrust of the *Guises* were vain and groundless, what are we to think of the precautions of Francis I. reported by very grave historians, as Bayle has shewn?† If the ambition of this illustrious family (for illustrious it certainly was) could be formidable to the Kings of France, what had not Elizabeth to apprehend, as the usurper of a crown, supposed to belong to one of their own race?‡ We shall venture to

\* "Elizabeth's life was a life of mischief and misery; of mischief to others, in the plots which she was always forming against them; and of misery to herself, in the fears and apprehensions which she was always entertaining of them. She was continually forging schemes of malignity against them, from some *visionary fears of her own* concerning them."—*Whitaker's Vindication of Mary Quecnof Scots*, vol. i. 39, 40. We copy this as, in our own estimation, one of the greatest perversions of history we ever met with. Camden knew better, when at the very outset of his history of her reign, contemplating the perilous course she had to run, and the way she took, "to purchase herself love amongst her subjects, amongst her enemies fear, and glory amongst all men," he observes, "How by these manly cares and counsels she surpassed her sex, and what she effected by most wisely *perverting, diverting, and most stoutly resisting*, let present and future ages judge, by those things which, with uncorrupt faithfulness, shall be delivered out of the very commentaries of the kingdom, as I may so term them." p. 32. Mr. Turner, a living historian, does not hesitate to say of Elizabeth's reign, "The tyrannical plans of others made her life a continued war, for the last thirty-five years, with the Popedom, Papal Hierarchy, and its Popish tenets, schools, and practices; and the history of her reign is the history of their ever-reviving attacks."—*Modern History of England*, Reign of Elizabeth, b. ii. ch. 18. We cannot help adding the following short passage from *M. Ferrand's Esprit de L'Histoire Paris*, 1809: "Elizabeth occupa le trône d'Angleterre dans les circonstances les plus difficiles où l'Europe se fût trouvée, et sa conduite fut perpétuellement un modèle de politique."

† See preceding note.

‡ Goodall finds fault with Melvil for "*injuriously* charging the Guises with being the chief instruments of all the troubles in Scotland."—Preface, p. xxi. We have no hesitation in saying

say, that in the then state of Europe, *Cecil's* memorial was any thing but visionary and futile. What he foresaw did not indeed happen, but only perhaps because he foresaw it in time to prevent it. This was his policy; a policy, perhaps, the least scrutinized, and the most unrequited, by a thoughtless posterity, of any that can be pursued or adopted.

It is to us, we must confess, very surprising, that those who have with an unbounded enthusiasm defended the cause of the injured Mary (for injured she was, past all denial) should not have seen that, in their violent abuse of Elizabeth as an usurper, a bastard—not to mention a hundred other foul names—they betray a temper which, if the same were displayed against her while she was alive by her enemies or rivals, was enough to account for all the ill-will she manifested towards them in return; and we have scarcely any doubt, notwithstanding all the courtly and high-flown addresses she received from other potentates, that beneath their fine words exactly such a temper was continually lurking. Henry II. of France was as profuse as any in his adulatory compliments and professions of friendship to the daughter of Queen Anne Boleyn, at the very time that he was urging the Pope to bastardize her, hurl her from her throne, and proclaim his daughter-in-law, Mary of Scots, to be the true Sovereign of England! but when, by the death of Henry, the *Guises* came into power, and their niece became Queen of France, as well as Scotland, the temptation to dethrone Elizabeth was naturally greatly increased, with regard to her French neighbour; and not to have mistrusted, in that perfidious age, any apparently friendly or conciliatory advances, would have amounted to a great want of vigilance and attention, on the part of any of Elizabeth's Ministers, Agents, or Diplomats. The vigilance and attention with which Elizabeth *was* served by some of her Ministers, Agents, and Diplomats, exceeds perhaps all that is to be

that we think Melvil was right. Goodall vulgarly adds, "How great pity was it that these Guises did not reward the Gentleman according to his demerits;" and he afterwards lays it down as a maxim, that "wherever a Scottish man is found getting a pension from the English Court, he may be pronounced to be a Traitor to his native country, without danger of mistake." In our first volume, we have shewn that pensions from the French Court bore no such ill name in the time of Henry VIII. or Edward VI., though it seems almost needless to repeat, what we have there shewn, that the French influence was far more detrimental to the true interests, peace, and tranquillity of Scotland than that of England. Goodall must be excused for his Scotch prejudices, even in the eighteenth century; but we shall nevertheless, as freely as ever, avow it to be our opinion that, in the sixteenth century, Scotland had worse enemies in France than in England, if we look to the objects in dispute.



found in the histories of other nations; but because that vigilance and attention were successful in keeping her on her throne, and preserving England and Scotland from the grasp of foreigners, and Protestantism from the ruin and overthrow which were contemplated by the irritated Romanists of all countries, the means adopted are traduced as uncalled for, unjust, insidious, and fraudulent, the whole is judged to be plot, conspiracy, and stratagem, on the part of *England*, when it was almost invariably *counterplot*.\* The latter is known from its effects, while the adverse plots have, in a great variety of instances, fallen into oblivion, or, in truth, never been revealed. The coarsest thing perhaps ever uttered against the unfortunate Queen of Scots, by John Knox, was as follows: "Of the tyranny of the *Guisian* blood, in HER, that for our unthankfulness now reigneth over us, we have had sufficient experience; but of any virtue that ever was espied in King James V., whose daughter she is called, to this hour we have never seen any sparkle." James V., as we have shewn in our former Volume, had virtues which, whether Mary inherited or not, we have no occasion to discuss here. The *Guisian* family, with all its bigotry and ambition, was renowned for bravery and courage, and therefore not to be contemned; but to mark the temper

\* We have a curious proof of this in a letter from the Secretary to Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir James Croft, December 12, 1559. Cecil had been watching the motions of the French, under a persuasion, which we think is supported by the most clear testimony of history, that in reinforcing their troops in Scotland, they had designs upon England; but he wished the breach of treaty to be thrown upon them, if possible, because he could not proceed against them openly, while his colleagues in the Council differed from him as to the French preparations, and because the kingdom was not in a state to *provoke* any avoidable war. Hearing, however, at last that they had, contrary to treaty, begun to fortify *Aymouth*, he writes thus to the two Commissioners:—"The tyme tarrieth not as ye see. This day the matter of Aymouth maketh us styrr; our shippes, being xii men of warr, well appoynted, with viii or x Victellers, with viii others, with munition, armure, powder, were appoynted to depart by the 20th hereof. And now, this daye also, we understand, that 40 Sayles be past *from France*, with men and vittell; so as ours be lyke to come too late. The matter is too weighty to be trifled; and so we all *now*, at *the last*, doo judge: wherein I wold to God some had been of more *spedy foresight*. You shall perceive, by the Quenes Majesties lettre, that because it is a violation of the treaty to fortify at Aymouth, ye may be the bolder to be doing with the French: if ye see that they do not fortify, then are they to be forborne untill the matter may be more earnestly followed; for els it were daungeroose to begyn the matter, and not to follow it with effect; and, on the other syde, if their fortifying shall seme a matter of difficulte for us hereafter to expell them, it wer better to begin in tyme with them."—*Sadler's Papers*, ii. 635. Camden tells (what some have thought an improbable story) that D'Oysel, the French commander, assembled the Scotch Nobles at Aymouth, and proposed to them the immediate invasion and conquest of England.

of the Romanists, if it had been allowed to spend its force in France, Scotland, and England, we may form some judgment, from the account given of James the Vth's *virtues*, by a countryman and contemporary of Knox, already often cited—we mean *Conæus*; not hesitating to refer this good King's untimely death to the secret agency of some English or Scotch *heretic*, in the army at Solway Moss,\* he regrets his loss, because as he had caused many *heretics* (Protestants) to suffer a *just* punishment by the *fire*, the *sword*, or the *halter*, it might be concluded, that had he been *permitted to live longer*, not a *single Protestant* would have been *left to pollute his native land*! The whole story may now be told, though much of it relates to what passed between Henry VIII. and James, as recorded in our first volume.

“*MARIA septem tantum dies nata Patrem amisit, ad cujus interitum merito BRITANNIA ingemuisse dicitur: eo siquidem regnante in procerum quorundam mentibus pullulare cepit, quæ dudum Germaniam concusserat, LUTHERI HÆRESIS, defecitque à majorum erga ROMANUM SEDEM OBEDIENTIA, impura captus libidine, HENRICUS VIII. Angliæ Rex: qui omnem movit lapidem, ut JACOBUM Regem sororis suæ filium ab avita erga CHRISTI VICARIUM fide avocaret (in qua Octoginta tres Scotiæ Reges, a prima sub victore I. An. Dom. ccciii. suscepta veritate, constantes permanserunt) quare Eboracum invitavit, et quia abnuerat (indignum quippe rebatur princeps CATHOLICUS ad colloquium cum APOSTATA descendere) crudeli bello petitus est; nec tamen anglorum arma tantum reformidabat, quantum ne in vasto borealium regionum incendio detrimenti aliquid apud suos religio caperet; quamobrem INQUISITORES adhibuit publicos, qui in cunctorum mores animadverterant, quamque doctrinam profiterantur investigarent. Nonnulli, quos *lethalis* infecerat *pastis*, IGNE CREMATI scelerum suorum pœnas dedere, aliqui ENSE,† alii LAQUEO periire; *nullus vivo JACOBO* impune tulit impietatem, mansuraque in fide SCOTIA credebatur, si Jacobus in vivis mansisset;‡ cujus mortem profligatus prope angliam hæreticorum, qui in castris latebant, perfidia exercitus accelerasse fertur.”—pp. 5, 6. And as if this Catholic writer were bent upon going further than Knox, in assigning to Mary a double inheritance of persecuting principles, he is careful*

\* Vol. i.

† Compare Bishop Leslie's praise of the Reformers for *their forbearance*, as already noticed, page 86.

‡ “The premature death of James V. of Scotland,” says McCrie, “saved the Reformers from destruction.”—i. 334.

to add, that Mary of *Guise*, the Queen of James V., was not in any degree behind him in the *hatred* she bore to the *Reformists*.\*

“Nec minus erat Mariæ GUISIÆ piæ admodum et religiosæ principis in CATHOLICÆ veritatis HOSTES, quam Jacobi mariti ODIUM.”†—Illo Patre, hac Matre genita MARIA STUARTA.

This is sufficient to mark the temper with which the commencement and progress of the Reformation in Scotland were contemplated by the Catholics, and the *expectations* they had formed of Mary’s co-operation in the great work of rooting out all heretics, if she had been suffered to attain to any exercise of arbitrary power.‡ And that this was her design, however she might be induced

\* See McCrie’s note on Mary of *Guise*’s hatred of Heretics.—*Life of Knox*, vol. i. 431, note FF.

† Of the Queen Regent’s *odium* of Heretics, there is a remarkable story extant, which seems too well authenticated to be at all questioned; and it may reasonably be mentioned as affording a clue to the extraordinary excitement of the human mind, upon religious subjects, during the struggles of the sixteenth century. Entering Perth, in violation of an agreement just concluded with the Lords of the Congregation, the Frenchmen who accompanied her, in discharging their pieces, directed them against the house of Patrick Murray, an active Reformer, and killed his only son. The dead body was displayed before the Queen’s eyes, who, under the infatuation of a feeling of unappeasable intolerance, declared that the accident was only to be lamented because it had happened to the son instead of the father. As we are writing of an age in which it often seems, to this day, almost impossible to account for an extraordinary want of feeling in persons of the greatest historical celebrity, on various occasions, we refer to this story as related of a *Queen of those days*, who, independent of such excitements, is allowed to have been a woman of many virtues, and truly amiable qualities.—See *Cook* on the Reformation in Scotland, ch. x.

‡ “Nursed from her infancy in a blind attachment to the Roman Catholic religion, every means was employed before she left France to strengthen this prejudice, and to inspire her with aversion to the religion which had been embraced by her people. She was taught that it would be the great glory of her reign to reduce her kingdom to the obedience of the Romish See, and to co-operate with the Popish Princes on the Continent in extirpating heresy. If she forsook the religion in which she had been educated, she would forfeit their powerful friendship; if she persevered in it, she might depend upon their assistance to enable her to chastise her rebellious subjects, and prosecute her claims to the English crown against an heretical usurper.”—*McCrie’s Knox*, ii. 22, 23. See further as to her private determination to restore Popery, though obliged for a time to temporize,—*ib.* 23. And, p. 24, her solemn mass on the first Sunday after her arrival, though it had been prohibited by an Act of the late Parliament; and, according to Knox, made a condition of her return on the invitation of the Protestants, that she should abstain from the celebration of the mass, (a *hard, rude, and unwarrantable* condition, if ever proposed, but soon relinquished, to their credit, by *Murray* and her Council, as far as regarded her own chapel.—*ib.* 31.) Of her fixed design,



to temporize at first, seems clearly proved by the evidence of many circumstances, adduced by the learned author of the *Life of Knox*. See particularly vol. ii. p. 23, and note H. p. 303. And, to refer again to the same author, *Conæus*, *who*, it may be asked, was the person that prevented her taking that course, which, according to her family connexions, appeared to be most *natural* to her? *NOTHUS* (as he is called), the *Bastard*; even Lord James Stuart, her natural brother; the very person who, when he had passed the seas to confer with his sister on the state of things in Scotland, and invite her to return to her native country, narrowly escaped being kidnapped, through the advice of Leslie, afterwards Bishop of Ross, Mary's chief counsellor of her own church. In fact, according to *Conæus*, Mary's *Catholicism* was to be measured by her *inveteracy* against *Heretics*, whatever might be her natural temper and disposition.

For what purpose, it may, and probably will be asked, are these things brought forward? merely to blacken the character of the Romanists, and shew that Mary deserved all that befell her? Far from it; we heartily wish she had escaped all the sufferings she underwent; and very assuredly we never wish to say more of the Catholics than truth requires. But truth does require, that their sentiments, during the times of which we are writing, should be weighed and considered in a work like the present, where we have to encounter, at every step, the foulest imputations against those who took the line in politics and religion which Lord Burghley himself principally pursued.\* Let Murray

however, to restore the Roman Catholic religion in Scotland, and of her determined resolution to resent all opposition that might be made to it, we have some curious testimonies adduced by McCrie, vol. ii. note H.

\* It is not only requisite, for the clearing of the characters of persons and actions during this century, and while the great revolution in the Church was going forward, to read the account of facts as given by both parties; but it is absolutely necessary, to the historian or biographer himself, to bring forward such passages as the above, that the temper of the times may be thoroughly understood. Hume is amused with the gaiety and alacrity with which the Reformer Knox speaks in his history of the assassination of Cardinal Beaton, noticed in our first volume. McCrie, in his *Life of the Reformer*, has an admirable note upon this (vol. i. note M, p. 40.), in which he shews, that if Protestants *rejoiced* on the death of *persecutors*, the Catholics fully as much *lamented* the escape of the *persecuted*. As *Conæus*, in the passage above, fairly condole with Pope Urban, to whom his book is dedicated, on the premature death of James V., as an interruption to the efforts of the royal Inquisitors, bent upon rooting out the Scotch heretics; in like manner, even the temperate and *honest* Keith, as he is called, contemplates the death of Beaton as a *hindrance*

have been the bad man some would have him to have been, though others are as warm in his praise, yet his politics with regard to Scotland were *Anti-Gallican* and *Anti-Guisian*; and his religion, as far as regarded his professions and associations, Protestant. These are the great objects to be kept in view, when we would review the history of those sad times; not in regard to Murray only, but to Elizabeth and her most able Ministers. And therefore we began our history with the very first struggles of Protestantism in Scotland as well as in England, through a natural feeling of respect and concern for the best interests of both countries, as constituting at present one great nation, entirely British in all its parts. And though the melancholy fate of Mary Stuart seems to have excited in Scottish writers a bitter enmity towards England, for its interference at this period, yet, as far as regarded the true interests of Scotland, the Scots appear to have been as much beholden to Elizabeth, and to her Ministers, as England. At the very period of which we are writing, Cecil probably entirely saved Scotland from French domination, though often thwarted by the *Philippians* at the English Court, who, in conjunction with French Envoys, were acquiring a contrary influence with Elizabeth; while Knox, in his rough way, but with a very zealous sincerity, upheld the cause of the Scottish Reformation, not merely against Mary and the Papists, but against Murray, Lethington, and other leaders of the Reformed party, who were in danger, as he judged, of being *beguiled* or *lulled* into a dangerous security, by Mary's *blandishments* and *insinuating behaviour*. The author of the Life of Knox is by no means backward to acknowledge, that the Scottish Protestants were much indebted to Cecil and Throckmorton for the assistance they received from England; (vol. i. p. 442.)—We have a remarkable testimony to adduce in proof of Mary's *management* at this time. The Cardinal de St. Croix, the Pope's Ambassador to the Court of France, writes to Cardinal Borromeo at Rome, in November 1561, only three months after her arrival in Scotland, under various *great disadvantages*, that the Grand Prior of France, one of Mary's uncles, and Mons. Danville had just

to the *same* measures, in the following passage: "What might have proved to be the issue of such procedure [Beaton's severe measures against the Reformers] had he enjoyed his life for any considerable time, I shall not pretend to judge: only this seems *to be certain*, that by his death the reins of the government were much loosened; and *some persons* came to be considerable soon after, who probably, if *he had lived*, had never got the opportunity to perpetrate such villanies under the cloak of religion, as 'tis certain they did; he being at least no less a *statesman* than a *clergyman*." This language, as McCrie rightly observes, needs no commentary.

arrived from Scotland, and brought information that the Queen was going on *successfully* in surmounting all opposition to her in that kingdom.\* This being true, she might well resent Elizabeth's imputations upon her *youth* and want of *experience*; to all appearance, nobody could know better what she was about, or proceed more regularly to the accomplishment of her designs. Though surrounded by Protestants, and her Ministry composed of them, in the autumn of 1562 the Scotch Catholics appear to have entertained great hopes of a change. We shall not attempt to unravel the mysteries of the conflict between Murray and the Gordons, on the Queen's memorable excursion to the North, during which the Lord James was made Earl of Murray, and his uncle Earl of Mar, to the great mortification of the Earl of Huntley, who, by taking arms to avenge the affront, lost his life in the cause; we can only refer to the best known histories of these transactions, leaving it to the reader to decide, whether

\* McCrie, ii. 304. The eminent persons to whom the Cardinal de St. Croix alludes, had not only been allowed to pass through England on their return to France, but been magnificently entertained by Elizabeth. They arrived in France on the 17th Nov. 1561, three months only after Mary's arrival in Scotland. If then St. Croix, the Pope's Ambassador, made the communication spoken of, there can be no doubt that Mary's *successful proceedings* bespoke great danger to the cause of the Reformation, and consequently to England and England's friends. We grant that she had a right to use all possible blandishments to turn the hearts of those who had acted contrary to her own principles, and so far in opposition to her; but if she prevailed, it was impossible to overlook the sacrifices to which both countries would be exposed. The English Government, and the zealous Protestants of Scotland, had nothing to look to but the defeat of all their previous efforts to emancipate England and Scotland from the tyranny of Rome and the ambition of the *Guises*. Elizabeth is sure to be blamed for interfering with Mary's views, even by authors who admit the enmity of Mary's foreign relatives. Dr. Cook, for instance, who never spares the English Queen, speaking of Mary's refusal to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh, says, she was confirmed in her refusal "by the advice of her uncles, who, *detesting Elizabeth*, used every method to *disturb the tranquillity of her reign*." Is not this some excuse for Elizabeth's angry feelings and jealousies; considering that the enmity of the *Guises* became manifest at the moment of her accession. Knox's rude speeches of his native Sovereign cannot in these days be excused; but if he had imbibed an opinion that subjects might resist the *royal* authority, in its endeavours to restore an *idolatrous* worship, his fault it would seem lay in fancying that Princes could be resisted or deposed by any other than the *Roman Pontiff*, according to the following maxim of the Church of Rome: "Christians cannot be suffered to *tolerate* any *Infidel* or *Heretic King*; if that King attempt to draw his subjects into *heresy* or infidelity. Yet it belongs to the *Sovereign Pontiff*, who is charged with the care of religion, to judge whether the King does or does not draw his subjects into the heresy. It thus rests with the *Sovereign Pontiff* to decide on the deposition of the King."—*Bellarmin Controverses du Pontife Romain*, lib. v. c. 6, 1596.



it were a mere private feud, or an attempt to rescue Mary from the hands of Murray with her own connivance, as is by some strongly alleged; but if this were not exactly so, there were movements in other parts, and such a confidence manifested by the Popish Clergy, according to Spottiswood, as to have drawn from Mary the remark, that, "She hoped, before a year was expired, to have the Mass and Catholic profession restored through the whole kingdom."\* Notwithstanding all the roughness of Calvinism, as displayed in the behaviour of Knox, Mary was undoubtedly making her way in a most extraordinary manner, and contrary to all that might have been expected had the tables been reversed. In the work entitled, "*Histoire du Calvinisme et celle du Papisme mises en parallèle, ou apologie pour les Reformateurs, pour la Reformation, et pour les Reformés, Rotterdam 1683,*" the following passage occurs, which I cite from Dr. McCrie's translation: "Mary," says the author, "was brought up in France, accustomed to see Protestants burned to death, and instructed in the maxims of her uncles, the Guises, who maintained that it was necessary to exterminate without mercy the pretended reformed. With these dispositions she arrived in Scotland, which was wholly reformed, with the exception of a few Lords. The kingdom receive her, acknowledge her as their Queen, and obey her in all things according to the laws of the country. I maintain, that, in the state of men's spirits at that time, if a Hugonot Queen (Elizabeth, *par exemple,*) had come to take possession of a Roman Catholic kingdom, with the retinue with which Mary came to Scotland, the first thing they would have done would have been to arrest her; and if she had persevered in her religion, they would have procured her degradation by the Pope, thrown her into the inquisition, and burned her as a heretic. There is not an honest man who dare deny this."†

\* See Robertson, and McCrie, particularly his note, vol. i. 59, from Sir Robert Gordon's Genealogical History of the earldom of Sutherland.

† It is curious to contrast this passage with the following one from Chalmers: "Had Mary returned to Scotland at the end of thirteen years, as complete a Hugonot as Arran, and as determined a Calvinist as Knox, the same misfortunes had befallen her, while Elizabeth's dissimulation governed England; while Murray's ambition influenced Scotland." It is not our business to deny either the dissimulation of the one, or the ambition of the other, generally. The principal point to be ascertained is, what were the objects of their dissimulation and ambition, if those were their ruling principles; and we must confess, we cannot help thinking they were to protect themselves, and their respective countries, from the ruinous effects of the dissimulation and ambition of others.

Among other things contemplated in the course of this year, was an interview between the two Queens, to take place at York, [or Nottingham Castle, according to a note of Lord Burghley's.] It is almost impossible to conjecture what the object of this could be: it is capable of proof to this day, that whatever professions of friendship might have been exchanged between the two sovereigns, or however important a perfect amity between the two kingdoms might appear, there was one point of difference that could not be got over.—Mary would not ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh without certain modifications, and Elizabeth would not admit of any modifications that should place Mary in the light of a claimant of the Crown of England, even next in succession to herself;\* on both sides, to apply an expression of Lethington's, there was such "courage and stomach," that it would seem to have been vain to expect that any concession would take place. Randolph, indeed, as well as Lethington, appears to have formed hopes and expectations, that if the two Queens could but meet, Mary might be taught to see better her own true interests, as well as those of her country. (See Miss Benger's Life of Mary, vol. ii. 165. and Randolph's Letter there cited.) Some hopes even were entertained that Mary, having a high idea of Elizabeth's sense and judgment, might have been prevailed on to abandon her religion and accede to the opinions of the Reformers, then regarded as forming a majority of her subjects. [Cook, iii. 118, 119.] But in all probability this would not have happened; Mary has been suspected of proposing it as an opportunity of shewing herself to the English, in hopes of attaching them to her interests as a claimant to the

\* Mary's claim to be *declared* next heir was plainly in derogation of Henry's will, on which Elizabeth's own title so much depended. Many writers, and Dr. Robertson among the number, have thought, that in ratifying the Treaty of Edinburgh, Mary would have relinquished her right *for ever*; but as she, about this very time, wished Lethington to be allowed to plead her right before the Parliament, she must have supposed that the Parliament, under all circumstances, might be called upon to decide upon disputed titles; and Elizabeth was quite willing to declare she would do nothing of herself to the prejudice of Mary's claims; adding, however, that if another had a better title (which, according to the will of Henry, was the case with the Suffolk line), it were unjust to require of her to make a public edict to such a person's prejudice. Had the arms and titles of England never been assumed by Mary and her husband, on the suggestion of the *Guises* and the French Court, the case might have been different, but as long as the Treaty of Edinburgh remained unratified by Mary, she might certainly be understood to imply, that the Arms and Title ought not to be relinquished upon demand, and, in fact, that they had not been wrongfully assumed.—See *Rapin*, upon the conduct of the two Queens on this point, and the term, "for the future."

English Crown; if so, it is nonsense to fancy that Elizabeth was to blame for deferring the meeting, or that she was merely swayed by a foolish apprehension that she should be *outshone in personal beauty and accomplishments*. That beauty and those accomplishments might have done more than merely mortify her vanity; they might have endangered her crown, if what has been imputed to Mary by some of her own admirers be correct. [*Cook*, iii. 121.] The two Secretaries, however, had much correspondence and communication upon the subject, and many formalities were gone through as though the parties were in earnest; the meeting was proposed to take place some time between the 20th of August and 20th of September, either at York, or “some convenient place betwixt the said City and the River of Trente.” The Queen of England was to be left at liberty to require the ratification of the Treaty made at Edinburgh, July 3, 1560. The Queen of Scots might enter the kingdom of England with a retinue of 1000 persons (French and Scots) and no more, and might use the rites and ceremonies of her religion, during her stay, without lett or impediment, and a regular passport or safe conduct (to be seen in *Haynes*) was duly prepared for her passage into England. But the troubles in France, in which the Princes of Lorraine bore a conspicuous part, apparently adverse to the interests of Elizabeth and the Reformed religion, put an end to the interview, or at least occasioned its postponement for the present, and at no time afterwards, though often talked of, and referred to the English Council, was it found expedient to renew the engagement. It may not, perhaps, after all, be judged unreasonable to refer to this intended interview, as some explanation of the alleged design to interrupt Mary on her way to Scotland. We have stated our reasons for supposing it might be for the end of informing the young Queen of the actual and real state of the affairs of both kingdoms, under the revolution going forward, and which in Scotland, by the Treaty of Edinburgh, had been as nearly as possible brought to a conclusion in favour of *Protestantism*, to the benefit of both countries; at all events, an interview seems to have been contemplated at this time for such purposes, and upon a footing of friendship; Lethington, Randolph, and *Cecil*\* himself, appearing to agree in the wish to bring it about. Reasons, however, have been given for Mary’s ultimately wishing to decline it, as well as Elizabeth.†

\* Throckmorton also seems to have thought it desirable, but likely to be prevented by the garboils in France.—See his Letter to Chaloner from Paris.—*Haynes*, 386.

† *Cook’s Reformation*, iii. 121, 122. and see Camden on the interview under the year 1562.



Towards the conclusion of this year, upon an illness that befel Elizabeth, Mary appears, through her Secretary Lethington, to have been very anxious to establish her claim to the English throne, and to wish to have it submitted to Parliament by Maitland himself, or rather *asserted* before the Parliament, as a claim she was prepared to support in case any thing fatal should occur. This eagerness, as Dr. Cook observes, could only tend, upon Elizabeth's recovery, to augment "the fear, antipathy, and jealousy, with which, *notwithstanding her deceitful expressions of tender affection*, she had long regarded her accomplished rival." Upon which we cannot help observing, that we do not believe that Mary was ever really cajoled by the deceitful *forms* of such royal letters, any more than that she could ever have so far deceived *herself*, as to fancy that *she* really felt any *workings* of nature within her own breast to love Elizabeth with such ardour, as many of her own letters are known to express. She may have wished to be upon good terms, and may have had a heart more inclined than Elizabeth's to the cordialities of a sincere friendship; but it is to betray great ignorance of the forms of a Court and royal communications (especially in such times as those were),\* to suppose that Elizabeth's expressions of love and affection were decidedly more deceitful than those of her "accomplished" (certainly) but not altogether artless "rival." It is impossible to suppose that she could really love, or even be very well inclined towards a person whom she had been constantly taught to regard as only a bastard child of that very Henry VIII. who had done what he could to disinherit her, and, consequently, as a usurper of her rights; a heretic condemned by the Pope; one also whom she had never seen, and yet, in the very letter she wrote to send by Lethington upon the above occasion, Mary professes to be Elizabeth's "dearest sister;" and as if that were not "eno' her richt gude sister and loving cusine."† These things demand some attention

\* "I wish," says Mr. Peyto, in a letter to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, in France, May 9, 1560, "that I may live to see as honest and sincere dealing between princes as between private friends; but I fear me that day wold be too longe, and that ere it come my beard will be more graye than nowe my head is by a great deale."—*Forbes*, i. 441, 2.

† In the petition of the Council to Elizabeth, March 23, 1560, [*Forbes*, i. 391.] are the following strong expressions relative to the designs against her, and evil dispositions towards her, as prevailing on the other side the water:—

"We do all certainly think, that the Queen of Scots, and for her sake, her husband, and the House of Guise, be in their hearts mortal enemies to your Majesty's person. Hereupon it followeth that we cannot interpret the proceedings of the French otherwise but as the same do manifestly shew themselves, and *as all other nations do judge* thereof; and that they will never cease,

in a portion of our English history so important, and still so dark, and in which not only the credit of Elizabeth, but of her great Minister, and through both, we need not hesitate to say, the credit of *England* itself is so much at stake. We can never too often repeat that it was not merely a conflict between two females, two rival Queens, but between all the kingdoms of Europe, and all the princes and statesmen of the age. Neither of these two Princesses were so much responsible for the beginning of the quarrel as their fathers, progenitors, and predecessors, their relatives, and the two parties into which their respective countries were divided before either of them were born.

In the month of June, 1562, the Secretary, overcome as it would seem by the weight of business at Court, and dissatisfied with the contentions in the University, seemed resolved to relinquish his high office of Chancellor of Cambridge. His letter to the University is still preserved, being to the following effect:—

“ June, 1562, 4 Eliz. After my hearty commendations, I do find causes, daily more and more, moving me to render to the University the office which I hold to be Chancellor thereof; and because you shall not think this manner of speech to proceed of a careless disposition towards the same, I shall shortly signify unto you some causes, as if I had leisure I could shew more.

“ First, indeed, I am not meet for the office, having no learning to judge of men learned, of which number that University ought to consist.

“ Secondly, I have no leisure to hear the causes, and less leisure to promote them, and, consequently, no opportunity to end them.

“ Thirdly, I am troubled to hear how in that University a great part of the Colleges are now of late become full of factions and contentions, and are like to increase. The redress whereof cannot come from me, as it ought to do from a Chancellor, because I can neither skill to judge of the controversies, (being risen upon question of laws and private statutes,) nor can come thither to subdue the same with my presence and with the authority of the office.

with their good wills, or without force of England, as long as your Majesty and the Scottish Queen liveth, to permit your Majesty to live in an assured peace; but will, at the least, continue their purposes by practice, either abroad or in this your realm, or in both.”

However shocking it may be to modern feelings to read such a denunciation of a whole family, yet there is nothing in it that exceeds our belief of its having been perfectly true at the time. This was the school in which Mary had been brought up, and here was the root of all the enmity shewn to her on the part of Elizabeth and England, not in the way of spite, but of defence. The whole petition of the Council should be read by those who would wish to understand the true bearings of one of the most perplexed histories of human transactions.

“ Lastly, which most of all I lament, I cannot find such care in the heads of houses there to supply my lack, as I hoped for, to the ruling of inordinate youth, to the observation of good order, and increase of learning and knowledge of God. For I see (if the wiser sort that have authority will not join earnestly together to overrule the licentious part of youth, in breaking orders, and the stubbornness of others that malign and deprave the ecclesiastical orders established by law in this realm) I shall shortly hear no good or comfortable report from thence. And to keep an office of authority, by which these disorders may be remedied, and not to use it, is to betray the safety of the same whereof I have some conscience.

“ Wherefore, with all my heart, I think it meet you should appoint this room to some one such as may come thither and visit the state thereof, and to set things in frame; and yet to keep a sure account of me, that I will remain as careful and willing to do good to the University, and to every member thereof, as I am now.

“ And so I end—praying you all to accept this my perplexed writing and complaint to proceed of a careful mind that I bear to that honorable and dear body of the University; whereof, although I was once but a simple, small, unlearned, and low member, yet have I as great plenty of natural humour of love towards the same, as any other that hath by degrees been rewarded to be in the highest place of that body; which comparison I make, not to impair the love of any other, but to express mine own: and so, for this time, I bid you all right heartily well to fare. From the Court, the . . . of June, MDLXII.

“ Your assured to use and command,

“ To the Vice-Chancellor, &c.”

“ W. CECIL.”

But the University would not listen to the proposal, if it could possibly be avoided. His loss they accounted *immedicabile vulnus*, a wound and sore, not to be healed. They, therefore, in great affliction, answered his letter, and sent their answer by two Heads of Houses, with other letters to the Archbishop and Dr. Walter Haddon, Master of the Requests, imploring their interposition, and promising a speedy and visible reformation if their prayers should succeed. The Archbishop and Dr. Haddon could not refuse to comply with the wishes of the University, and, therefore, both of them wrote letters to the Secretary, and gave them to the messengers to convey to him, with the answer to his own, sent by the University; and by these means he was prevailed upon to continue in the



office, not, however, without sending down injunctions for the reforming the scholars in divers things wanting.—See *Strype's Life of Parker*, and *Peck's Desiderata Curiosa*, Lib. vii. No. xiii.

The Queen this year began to give aid to the French Protestants, but not as in *rebellion* against their lawful Sovereign, her aid being directed, as it was alleged, rather to the deliverance of the King, Queen, and Princes of the Blood, from the thralldom of the Princes of the House of Lorrain. The history of the English intervention, at this particular time, is certainly very remarkable, and, in general, very little understood. The Scottish Protestants having been supported against those who *held the reins* of government in that country, it has been generally thought that the French Protestants were assisted by Elizabeth upon exactly the same grounds, and that her interference with other countries constantly tended to uphold the *subject* against the *Sovereign*, to the disturbance of her neighbours, upon principles very obnoxious, if directed against herself; for she was certainly no lover of rebellious subjects; but, as the Scottish Protestants had at their head some of the highest natural born subjects of the realm, so the Protestants of France, or Hugonots, as they are most commonly called, had on their side such high and important personages, that, independent of all other considerations, they might reasonably be accounted to have the good of their country at heart, and, indeed, the independence of the Crown. It may, in truth, be said of Protestantism in general, wherever it had the least chance of prevailing, that it had not only a tendency to rescue the civil and religious liberties of mankind from an unbearable thralldom, but that, in regard to the struggle it had to undergo in the several states of Europe, it was constantly opposed to an unbending *tyranny*, as well civil as ecclesiastical. It had generally a Court of *Inquisition* watching its progress, under rulers and ministers quite ready to approve its decisions, and cause its sentences to be carried into execution.\*

\* This sentence was written before I had read the following passage in *Bayle* [Art. Francois de Lorraine]:—

“ Peu s'en falut qu'ils n'établissent en France le Tribunal de l'Inquisition; ils y travaillèrent de toute leur force, et il falut que pour détourner ce coup le *Chancelier* s'avisât de proposer au Roi l'Edit de Romorantin, très rigoureux contre ceux de la Religion—c'est donc à ces deux freres qu'on peut imputer tous les malheurs des Guerres civiles de ce tems-là ils s'oposèrent à la liberté de conscience des Protestants, ils fomentèrent la persecution, ils entretenirent dans le Roiaume l'esprit sanguinaire, contre le droit essentiel, et le plus inalienable dout l'homme peut jouir, et celui que les Souverains doivent regarder comme le plus inviolable.”—Note C. tome ii. 648. see note G. 649.

England, under the *administration*, as it has been called, of Queen Elizabeth's great Minister, the subject of this Memoir, has long borne the blame of *wantonly* exciting disturbances and confusion in other countries, to secure peace and tranquillity at home; but, indeed, as we endeavoured to shew at the very commencement of our undertaking, there was no want of disturbance or confusion in all the countries of Europe, at that period, without the intervention of England, nor was there any chance of such disturbances being allayed amongst her more immediate neighbours, or the rival parties reconciled, except, perhaps, for the sole purpose and design of bringing a greater force against England.

The situation of France in the first years of the reign of Charles IX. was, perhaps, the most confused and extraordinary that could possibly be conceived, there being three parties struggling for the mastery, sometimes separately, but, for the most part, two against one. We may form some idea of the heterogeneous constitution of the Government from the following account: The Regency was confirmed in no very regular or formal manner on the Queen Mother, enemy to the Guises, and who, to combat their power, had called in the Constable Montmorency, heretofore the marked opponent of the Duke of Guise, and caused him to be appointed generalissimo of the forces. The superintendence of the finances, in the meanwhile, was committed to the Cardinal of *Lorraine*; and the King of Navarre, brother to the Prince of Condé,\* who had a fair claim to be Regent, and who had been expected to stand at the head of the Hugonots, and, in conjunction with them, to maintain the dignity of the Princes of the blood, after ceding, as it were, the Regency to the Queen, condescended to accept the comparatively subordinate office of Lieutenant-General of the kingdom; he was even drawn farther into the toils of the Guisian faction afterwards, so as to induce the Queen to form an union with the other Princes of the

Having spoken of the edict of Romorantin, it may be well to see what Millot says of it in his *Hist. Mod.* tom. ii. 362, and compare the course taken by the Chancellor de l'Hopital with what is said in our first volume of Cecil's intimacy with Cardinal Pole.

\* The conspiracy which broke out at Amboise, March 1559-60, to wrest the Government out of the hands of the Guises, during the life of Francis II., had nearly been fatal to the Prince of Condé; being discovered before it could take effect, the Guises had power enough not only to charge him with being at the head of it, but to have him tried by the Estates assembled at Orleans, Nov. 1560, and condemned to die, the execution being even fixed for the 10th of December. On the death of Francis, which happened on the 5th of that very month, and the accession of Charles IX., he was released by the latter, but only to place himself afresh, as it turned out, at the head of the Protestants, upon receiving additional provocation.

blood, and to cause an edict to be passed, for permitting the Hugonots to hold their meetings in the *suburbs* of the town, upon condition of delivering up to the Catholics the Churches they had possession of *in the towns*. This was called the *edict of January*, of which so much is said in the letters of Throckmorton. Camden relates that Elizabeth had been informed, that, to secure the King of Navarre, the *Guises* had secretly offered to him the hand of their niece the Queen of Scots, and the *kingdom of England* in dowry; engaging also, with the aid of Spain, to procure the Pope to dissolve *his* marriage with Jeanne d'Albret, his then wife, Queen of Navarre, the firm and constant friend of the Protestants; and that this was the occasion of the suspension of the interview between Mary and Elizabeth, on the part of the latter.

From this account we may well perceive what grounds there were for disturbance and confusion in France, if left entirely to its own politics, and we may guess how much this confusion was capable of increase, if what *Bayle* has collected concerning the two parties be true; namely, that *Religion*, after all, was but a *colour* or *pretence* for what was chiefly, if not entirely, a *political* struggle; that, in fact, the *Guisians* would have become *Hugonots*, and the *Condeians Catholics*, had such changes promised, at any time, to have given them an advantage over their adversaries in the *State*. It is a curious thing that is alleged by a Protestant writer of the times, that the Pope had observed to the Bishop of *Auxerre*, that he would have given a hundred thousand crowns to have had the Cardinal de Lorraine become a Hugonot, being assured that the enmity borne to him by that party would immediately have made the latter all good Catholics. It is certain that the hatred in which the *Guises* were held by Catherine de Medicis had, at one time, nearly made a Protestant of the *niece* of *Leo X.*; she governed herself by the old maxim of all confusion, "*divide et impera.*" "*Catherine de Medicis,*" says Millot, "*dont toutes les vues se portoient a la domination, dont l'ame artificieuse se plioit à toutes les circonstances, dont la maxime favorite étoit de diviser pour regner,*" &c.—*Hist. Mod.* T. ii. 361, 2. The whole passage is worth reading by those who think Elizabeth and her great Minister were the principal authors of *confusion* in the sixteenth century. This liberal and judicious writer, indeed, begins his Eleventh *Epoque* (from the year 1559 to the reign of Henry IV.) with a passage from *de Thou*, lamenting the necessity he felt himself under of describing the horrible state of his distracted country at this time, and to expose the miseries to which it was subjected for the space of forty years by the errors and vices of



the great people, and the pernicious counsels of its rulers and ministers; and he adds the following remark of his own: “Je cite volontiers ces paroles d’un grand homme, parce que même dans notre siècle la vérité historique trouve des censeurs toujours prêts à condamner ce qu’ils ignorent, ou ce qu’une fausse politique leur fait cacher.”\* There were two parties all the while in France itself that stood quite as much in awe of the ambitious designs of the *Guises* as England could do. It was not difficult, therefore, for England to decide upon the part she was to take if she looked only to her own security; the more powerful the *Guises* should become in the neighbouring kingdom, the greater danger to herself, as well from France as from Scotland.

The opening, therefore, that was made for the interference of England in the struggle now on foot, was not merely to support the Protestants against the Catholics, much less subjects in rebellion, against their sovereign, but, in opposition to a foreign faction, (for the *Guises* were foreigners in France,—see *M. de Keralio*, ii. 507.) to give aid to the *Princes of the blood*, having the Prince of Condé, brother to the King of Navarre, at their head, and even to rescue the King himself, the Queen Regent, and the King of Navarre, if possible, from the overbearing influence and insatiable ambition of the Princes of *Lorraine*.† It was no wonder that these “*garboils in France*,” to use an expression of our Ambassador there, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, should interrupt the projected interview of the two Queens, Mary being unhappily so closely connected with the principal authors of the above confusion and alarm to France, England, and Scotland.

It would be going out of our way to enter farther into the history of the affairs of France, than as they were a continual object of care and attention to the Secretary. The edict of January, of which we have spoken, as the fruit of

\* See also the History of Elizabeth by Mad<sup>me</sup>. de Keralio, and Ferrand’s *Espit de l’Histoire*, tom. iii. 310.

† “Les plus grands Panégyristes de ce Duc (Francois) de Guise,” says Bayle, “ne sauroient le disculper d’une très-injuste, et très-violente usurpation; car ce n’est pas seulement l’autorité souveraine que l’on usurpe, on peut aussi mériter le nom odieux d’usurpateur, lors qu’on s’empare de la puissance qui n’est due qu’aux Princes du sang, et qu’on les éloigne de la part qu’ils doivent avoir au gouvernement de l’Etat sous un Roi mineur; Or c’est ce que firent les *Guises* sous le Regne de Francois II. mari de leur niece, en abusant de la foiblesse de ce Prince, sans garder aucunes mesures de bienfiance, on veut même qu’ils aient eu dessein de faire mourir les premiers Princes du sang.”—The last fact has the support, in Bayle’s Notes, of a very curious story, extracted from a Life of the *Duc de Guise*, published at Paris, 1681.

an accidental reconciliation between the Queen Mother and the Princes of the blood, gave such spirits to the Protestants, that, notwithstanding the persecutions that had taken place since the affair of *Amboise*,\* they soon shewed themselves in greater numbers, and, having the Prince of *Condé* and the *Colignis* again at their head, behaved themselves apparently with such an undaunted confidence as greatly to excite the jealousy of the *Guises*. At the small town of *Vassi*, in Champagne, a rencontre taking place between the servants of the Duke of Guise and some of the Hugonots assembled for worship in a barn, brought the Duke himself to the spot, where being hurt with a stone, the resentment of his servants was raised to so high a pitch, as to terminate in the slaughter of about sixty of the Protestants; the rest, with their minister, who was also wounded, being put to flight. This stands recorded in history as the massacre of *Vassi*,† a transaction differently represented by the opposite parties; the one regarding it as a *premeditated*,‡ unprovoked assault on the Hugonots, the other as only an accidental fracas.

\* The conspiracy of *Amboise*, as explained by those who were engaged in it, had for its object exactly what the Queen and English Council professed to have in view, in the succours sent to the Prince of Condé; this may plainly be seen from what Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio relates of the Baron de Castelnau in the following passage:—"Les conjurés ne formèrent point le coupable projet de la revolte et de la trahison qu'on osa leur imputer; ils n'avouèrent que le dessein de se saisir des *Guise*, et de leur faire leur proces, comme perturbateurs du repos de l'Etat. Quoiqu'on les ait accusés de projets criminels, on ne les a jamais prouvés; le Baron de Castelnau, l'un des plus braves hommes de ce temps, entendant lire sa sentence, qui le condamnoit pour crime de lèse Majesté s'ecria vivement, "Je n'ai jamais attenté sur la personne du Roi, ni de la Reine, ni de la Reine mère, ni de ses frères, ni des Princes du sang, ni d'aucun de ceux dont les loix ordonnent de révéler la Majesté, si l'on pretend que je sois coupable de ce crime, pour avoir pris les armes contre les *Guises*, ces *étrangers* qui ont usurpé le gouvernement sur les Princes du sang, il faut auparavant les declarer rois."—Elizabeth and her great Minister are so constantly accused of *creating* disturbances in other countries, and *abetting* subjects in rebellion against their proper sovereign, that it is well to shew, that the disturbances with which they interfered did not originate with them, and that the succours they afforded to one party against the other, were to the defence of the persecuted, and of ancient rights and liberties against the encroachments of inordinate ambition, usurped power, and the most relentless bigotry; and it should be constantly recollected, that the *Guises* were, in reality, *foreigners* in France as well as in Scotland: the disturbance of *both* countries may be said to have originated with *them*.

+ 1562. "March 1. The slaughter of Vassy, at which time the troubles of France began."—*Lord Burghley's Diary*.

† See Bayle, art. Francois de Lorraine, Note D. The situation of *Vassi* was such as to excite, in a very particular manner, the jealousy of the *Guises*; it was near the family estate and residence of *Joinville*, where the Duchess Dowager lived, who had an apprehension that if Calvinism got a

The Catholics hailed it as a sort of *triumph* over the famous *edict* of *January*, and thereby exasperated the Prince of *Condé* and his party, who could not be expected to do less than meditate some retaliation; the mere probability of which, as though the quarrel itself had been a concerted measure of the *Guises*, was seized upon by the Duke as an occasion for more strictly securing the person of the young King, who, with the Queen his mother, saw himself most reluctantly placed under the power and authority of what was denominated the *Triumvirate*, the Queen herself being brought into great jeopardy by a conspiracy to deprive her of the Regency. And here we cannot help remarking, that the *Triumvirate*, of which we have just spoken, was as strong an instance, perhaps, as any that could be given, of the confusion of parties at that time in France. There had been no greater opposer of the *Guises* than the Constable; so much so, as to have been redeemed from captivity, as it were, by Henry II., on purpose to support that King against them. On occasion of the present troubles, he had been solicited to join the Queen, and afterwards more earnestly to associate himself with the Prince of *Condé* and the *Colignis*, as likely to give an important strength to their party; but as his attachment to the Catholic Religion was not to be shaken, this very appeal of the party at the head of the *Hugonots* threw him into the arms of the *Guises*. The Duke of *Guise* and his son, the Prince of *Joinville*, watching their opportunity, with the aid of the *Marechal de St. André*, drew him entirely over to their side. The Duke and the Constable became entirely reconciled, communicated together at the same altar, and with the *Marechal de St. André*, who had assisted in bringing about the agreement, formed that *Triumvirate* mentioned above.† In the meanwhile, the Prince of *Condé* with the *Hugonots* seized upon the city of *Orleans*, and thereby placed themselves in a situation of marked and open hostility, affirming in

footing so nigh, she should be unable to keep it out of *Joinville*. The Duke was probably resolved, if possible, to frustrate the effects of the *edict* of *January*.—See *Bayle's citations from Davila*.

\* To shew how difficult it is to arrive at the exact truth of any historical events, and the necessity of scrutinizing facts as closely as possible, after trusting to *Daniel*, *Millot*, and other French writers, who had positively spoken of the *Marechal de St. André* as the third person of the famous *Triumvirate*, I found in the *Dictionnaire Historique*, under the art. *Antoine de Navarre*, that the latter was one of the *Triumvirate* with the *Duc de Guise* and the Constable; this puzzled me for some time, as it was not unlikely that in compliment to the King of *Navarre* he might have been admitted as one of that confederacy, but on turning to the art. *Albon* in the same *Dictionnaire*, I found the case to be as *Daniel* and others had represented, and that, in fact, *Albon*, *Marquis de Fronsac*, *Marechal de St. André*, was one of the *Triumvirs*.



their manifestoes, that they took arms only in resentment of the violation of the edict of January, and to deliver the King from the captivity in which he was detained. This threw the whole kingdom into a blaze ; many associated themselves to the Prince, under an obligation to render him obedience till the King should come of age, while an army was prepared to march against him under the command of his apostate brother the King of Navarre, accompanied by the Duke of Guise, the Constable Montmorency, and the young King, whom they carried with them, as it were, in custody.\*

It was in this posture of affairs that Elizabeth's assistance was first publicly afforded to the Prince of Condé and the Hugonots, and a treaty formally concluded,† by which she engaged to assist them with all her forces and certain subsidies, upon condition that they would deliver up to her, for the security of her troops, *Havre-de-Grace*, and that she should not be obliged to resign it, till the Prince of Condé should have procured for her the restitution of Calais.

But of the part taken by England, there is a very good, though certainly not a very clear explanation, to be seen in certain instructions sent to Throckmorton, to be communicated to the Queen Mother, Aug. 17, 1562, many months before the edict of January, and the affair at Vassi.

“To conclude, we are forced to leave to the wisdom of our good sister the Queen Mother, to consider of our opinion conceived of these matters, what she shall think meet to be done for the staying of these great troubles likely to follow ; for that we cannot, without some note of temerity, enter to give any advice, except we were more particularly informed of the whole proceedings, and the humours of both these parties, betwixt whom we think the controversy

\* Mad<sup>le</sup>. de Keralio has given a lively picture of the confusion of this conflict :—“Il y avoit en France quatorze armées opposées les unes aux autres, dans lesquelles on voyoit combattre les fils contre leurs pères, les frères contre leurs frères, les amis contre leurs amis, *les vieillards, les femmes, et les enfans, renfermés dans l'interieur des villes, n'osoient lever les mains au ciel pour demander la victoire,*” with much more to the same effect, tom. iii. 150. We cannot refrain from adding the compliment this sagacious writer has paid to our country at this particular period : “L'Angleterre étoit alors la première puissance de l'Europe, la plus florissante, et la plus paisible, étant gouvernée par le plus sage des souverains. Elizabeth fut l'honneur le rempart et l'appui des Protestans persécutés dans tous les états, elle unit constamment dans toutes ses negociations les interets des infortunés aux siens, et ajouta au bonheur de son regne, la gloire d'avoir eu pour objet le bien de l'humanité.” 157.

† See this Convention.—*Forbes*, ii. 48.

resteth; considering it is not granted us to understand the same, we can do no more but, as one that hath an interest with other Christian princes in the public weal of Christendom, conceive an inward compassion in our mind for the trouble thereof, and a natural care for our own preservation; and so, consequently, wish well to all these causes generally, and foresee our own surety particularly.”—*Forbes*, ii. 25.

There is something in this like a burlesque upon state papers, but perhaps the more honest on that account. In the notorious perplexity of French politics at this time, it was utterly impossible to understand the views of the different parties, but there was no difficulty in foreseeing the dangers to England, from a certain result and issue of matters, and no want of care to provide accordingly for her surety, by siding with those most adverse to the tyranny of the Guises,\* among whom, in fact, were the *King*, the *Queen Regent*, and all the *Princes of the blood*;† as appears from the terms of the instructions given to Sir Thomas Smith. “Secondly, you shall say, that we have well perceived from the beginning, and so do more and more, that the beginners of these troubles in that country are not disposed of themselves to have any end made of their troubles, but such as shall be dangerous to the King and his people: and therewith also we evidently

\* The beginning of the Convention on the part of the Prince of Condé is very remarkable.

“*Illustrissimus Princeps de Condé ad defendendum Rothomagum, Diepe, et Havre de Grace in Normandia, et eorundem oppidorum habitatores, aliosque serenissimi Francorum Regis subditos qui sese in hæc oppida receperunt, a cæde et intentu qui in eos a Duce GUIGIO, ejus fratribus, et aliis GUISIANÆ Factionis hominibus crudeliter intentatus est; et pro auxilio, &c.*

In a despatch to Spain, Sep. 22, 1652, the Queen thus expresses herself to Philip in regard to the affairs of France:—

“Lastly, which toucheth us most nearly and properly, we perceived that the Duke of Guise, and his House, was the principal head of one part, and that they daily so increased their force, as in the end they became commanders of all things in France—and thereupon such manner of hostile dealing used, in diverse sorts, against our subjects, as we were constrained to look about us, what peril might ensue to our own estate and country.”—*Forbes*, ii. 53.

† *Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio*, speaking of the imprisonment and sentence passed on the Prince of Condé, after the affair of Amboise, thus describes the opposition between the *Hugonots* and *Guisians*: “La prison du Prince de Condé, et son execution prochaine, tenoient en suspens toute l’Europe. Qui n’eut considéré avec étonnement, d’un côté les efforts d’une faction affoiblie par les supplices et les massacres, mais soutenue par les premières têtes de la nation; de l’autre, la prepondérance d’un parti formé par des étrangers aux gages de la France, qui trahissant tous les droits de l’hospitalité, s’étoient rendus maîtres de l’état, et faisoient à leur gré couler le sang des plus braves et des meilleurs citoyens!”

see, that by their proceedings our danger is so joined with his, as we cannot but have regard thereunto; and upon these two grounds, specially it is, to procure the preservation of the King and his people in these his tender years, and to divert the dangers that otherwise might follow to our own estate, we are constrained to use such means as we do.”\*

The assistance given therefore to the Hugonots of France was, in many respects, very similar to the case of Scotland; in both instances, the tyranny of the *Guises* was the real object of contention, not necessarily to the overthrow of the *royal* authority, in either country, nor with any designs absolutely inimical to the peace and tranquillity of France or Scotland, but, in conjunction with some of the greatest men in the nation, to preserve their rights and liberty, against an usurping and domineering party, hostile to the best interests of their native country.† It was in the month of October, 1562, that the Secretary received from his great friend, Sir Thomas Smith, who had been dispatched to France as an Ambassador, in aid of Throckmorton (returning on a leave of absence), the following piece of information: the letter is dated from Paris, Oct. 18, 1562. “You perceive what Sir Nicholas [Throckmorton] doth think of their Ambassador in England, and I am certainly advertised by divers *Scots*, that there be divers sent already, and more to be sent, to move the Queen of Scots to break with you, and to make war out of hand.” Whether this information were true or not, it serves to shew, how generally Scotland was held to be connected with the affairs of France, while under the power and influence of the *Guises*; but in the allusion to the Ambassador in England, and Sir

\* See the declaration, from a copy in the Secretary’s own hand, of the causes which moved the Queen [Elizabeth] to take arms.—*Forbes*, ii. 69. In Lord Burghley’s diary, we find, under the date of Sep. 22, 1562, the following entries: “the Queen of England took into her protection the Prince of Condé and his party.” “The same time a contract between the Queen’s Majesty and the Prince of Condé, M. de Rohan, the Admirall of France, de Gramont, M. de Pyennes, Bryckmoth, Marq; for delivery of Newhaven, and to receive 100,000 crowns.” “Sep. 27, The Queen Majesty took into her protection the French King’s subjects in Normandy, being oppressed by the tyranny of the House of *Guise*, and published a declaration, printed.”

† The resemblance of the two cases is noticed in the Queen’s Manifesto in the following terms: [*Forbes*, ii. 79.] “Sur ce souvenirs, comment puis naguaires nous ayt advisé a delivrer le peuple et subjects de la Royne d’Ecosse, estans lors en la même misere et adversité par la semblable persecution d’icelle Maison de *Guise*, du danger, destruction, et ruine; les contraindre par tel moyen a l’obeissance de leur Royne, de laquelle presentement elle Jouit.” See also the Queen’s answer to the second declaration of Monsieur de Foix, corrected by Cecil.—*Forbes*, ii. 190, 191.



Nicholas Throckmorton's opinion, he plainly refers to a letter from the latter, to Queen Elizabeth, only three days before, and in which is the following passage :

“ The House of *Guise*, with the advice of the *Cardinal of Ferrare*, and the *Spanish Ambassador* here, have lately dispatched Villemont and La Crocque, servants to the Queen of Scotland, to pass through your Majesty's realm, and there to make some trouble if they see any opportunity ; and, likewise, to exasperate the Queen of Scotland and her Papistical Council, to make some trouble in your Majesty's realm upon the frontier, and also to do what they can to deprive the Earl of Mar, Secretary Lethington, and all others which favour the Protestant religion, of their credit and authority about the said Queen of Scotland.”\*

The Cardinal of Ferrara, who was then the Pope's Legate in France, seems to have been a very suspicious character† to many of Elizabeth's Council, so as to render them very jealous of Sir Thomas Smith's holding any conferences with him ; of which the Secretary found it necessary, in a private and friendly manner, to give him intimation in a letter to the following effect : “ But to write plainly and friendly unto you, as I would you should if our places were changed, the most here have misliked that you have treated with the Legate, and seem willing that you should have been reprimanded therefore. But therein I and others unto your good meaning have so tempered the cause, as thereof you shall hear no otherwise, except it be by me and some others your good friends.”

We may judge from this, how hard a task the Secretary had upon his hands, even with the Council. It could not be the *Philippians* who were thus adverse to the Legate ; another party was in all likelihood at work, of whom we shall have more to say hereafter ; at all events, it may serve to shew what a confusion of parties there was in almost all the states of Europe, and how

\* He also notices some proceedings to disturb Ireland, through the Spanish Minister, the Bishop of Aquila, and in the same letter informs the Queen of a project on foot by the Cardinal of Lorraine, to marry his niece the Queen of Scots to Ferdinand second son of the Emperor, to procure the Empire for the latter, to the disappointment of Maximilian, and to conclude with the Emperor a Papistical league against all heretics.

† He was the son of *Lucretia Borgia*, daughter of Alexander VI., the impure offspring of a most horrible father ; the Cardinal was reminded of the impurities of both, in very severe libels published against him, while in France, and which made him lower his tone greatly. See *Jurieu's History of the Council of Trent*.

many dangers England, and those who had to administer her concerns, constantly had to guard against.\*

There are extant such full accounts of the views of the English Government, in aiding the cause of those opposed to the Guisian faction in France at this period, that it is almost needless to do more than refer to them as they are to be found in Forbes's View of the Public Transactions in the Reign of Elizabeth, where most of the memorials, state-papers,† and correspondence of the several ministers, from the very commencement of the Queen's reign to the middle of the year 1563, are to be seen at length. Of the conspicuous and prominent, but very delicate and troublesome situation in which the Secretary was placed, as the channel of *all* communications, they afford abundant and sufficient proofs. That the power of the *Guises* was the object to which the attention of the English Government was almost solely directed is most certain; but in taking a position in France, under all appearances of hostility, the explanation given went to these three points: that it was not in opposition to the *King of France*, but rather in support of his just rights; that the care of his person and kingdom had been assigned by the three Estates, not to the *Guises*, but to the Princes of the blood, whose lawful authority, therefore, and dignity, the *Guises* were seeking to subvert, disparage, or supersede; and, finally, that though the English troops had taken possession of certain places in

\* At this very time, Throckmorton was supposed to be pursuing some by-ends, and anxious, if he could, to discredit the mission of Smith.—See *Strype's Life of Sir Thomas Smith*, ch. viii.

† Frequent allusion being made in these Papers to the severe sufferings of the Protestants under the tyranny of the *Guises*, we shall extract the following account of a succession of executions, to be read in one of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton's letters to the Queen, dated from Amboise, March 21, 1559.—*Forbes*, i. 378. "This heat caused upon a sudden a sharp determination to minister justice; and the two last taken were the same forenoon hanged, and two others for company; and afterwards the same day divers were taken, and in the evening nine more were hanged; all which died very assuredly and constantly for religion, in singing of psalms. Divers were drowned in sacks, and some appointed to the wheel; amongst all those that were taken, Mons. de Sanfar, a knight of th' order, found twenty-five in a house together; and because they would not come forth he set the house on fire. Whereupon they issued, and one of them, seeing his fellows taken, returned back and burned himself. The xviith of this present there were twenty-two of these rebels drowned in sacks, and the xviith of the same, at night, twenty-five more. Among all these which be taken there be eighteen of the bravest captains of France. As they be taken they come before the Council, and there (after they be questioned withal and examined) they be one after another condemned to die." The above, it should be added, relates to the Conspiracy of *Amboise*, which took place in March, 1559-60.

France, without the express consent of the *King*, they were quietly put into their hands by those who held them under the King's appointment and authority, and, in fact, to assist in restoring the King to his proper freedom of action. The recovery of Calais, as a remote object, was certainly a material point in the negotiation, but the prospect of success seems to have been very small, and, in fact, things did not terminate as might have been once fondly expected. The command of *Newhaven*, as it was then generally called by the English,\* was given to the Earl of Warwick, the elder brother of Leicester, and it must, we think, be acknowledged by all who may be at the pains to read his correspondence with the Government, as extant in Forbes's Collection, that no subject could have borne up with more courage and patience against a succession of adverse and very trying circumstances, than it fell to the lot of this noble earl to do. The occupation of *Havre-de-Grace* by the English troops, was very naturally the occasion of drawing the army opposed to the Prince of Condé into *Normandy*, sooner than would probably otherwise have been the case. The Queen Mother was exceedingly angry with the Prince for having entered into the treaty with Elizabeth, upon the condition of any such surrender; and, to prevent the English passing further into the kingdom, persuaded the King of Navarre, the Duke of Guise, and the Constable, to turn their arms against *Rouen* before they laid siege, as had been proposed, to Orleans. Her counsel in this instance was listened to, and Rouen besieged towards the end of September, 1662; about 2000 of the English troops from Havre and Dieppe are said to have previously arrived there to strengthen the garrison. Though bravely defended at first, it was not possible to retain it long against the forces opposed to it, commanded principally by the King of Navarre, but it was attended with one loss on the part of the besieging army, which has rendered it very memorable. For it was here that, in the 45th of age, this unfortunate Sovereign, a brave, but injudicious Prince, received a wound which soon terminated his life. It was before the conclusion of the year, viz., on the 19th of December, that the first serious engagement between the opposing armies of Catholics and Calvinists took place, commonly called the battle of *Dreux*; of which an account is to be read in many authors. Great bravery was displayed on both sides, but it terminated in favour of the Catholics, in the capture of the Prince of Condé on one

\* Havre-de-Grace.



side,\* and of the Constable on the other; though the Catholics kept the field, the army opposed to them was ably preserved by the Admiral [*Coligni*.] In this battle, another eminent person, one indeed of the famous Triumvirate, lost his life, the *Marechal de St. André*; whose horse being killed under him, is said to have been barbarously shot with a pistol, by a person who owed him a private grudge.

Before we advert to what was passing at home at this time, in regard to the settlement of the Church (a subject which appears, as much and as constantly as all other public concerns, to have occupied the mind, or rather perhaps we should say, to have been forced upon the attention of the vigilant and indefatigable Secretary), we cannot omit to notice the very curious account given by Camden, of a visit the Queen received from O'Neale of Ireland; Shan, or John O'Neale, as he was called, the true and lawful son of *that very Con O'Neale*, surnamed Bacco, or the Lamé, whom Henry VIII. had created Earl of Tyrone, and *with whose chaplains*, the subject of this Memoir, as related in our first volume, held that memorable disputation, which *led to his first introduction at Court*. Shan, or John, it seems, having made away with his base brother, Matthew, Baron of Dungannon, who, upon a pretence of his being legitimate, had obtained some advantages over him at the hands of his father, despoiled the latter of all rule, leaving him to die of grief, after having taken on him the title of O'Neale, by a strange mode of election, that of throwing his shoe over his head; this half-savage chieftain thought to run before the law, by at once breaking out into an open rebellion; but a considerable English force being

\* The English minister, Throckmorton, who was present unarmed at this battle, was taken prisoner as well as the Prince of Condé. The account he sent of it to the Queen is very curious: he gives great credit to the Duke of Guise, and throws no small blame on many of the Prince's army; and yet it would seem that the victory (if it were decidedly such) was hard gained by the Duke. On the 25th of Dec., Throckmorton dined with the Duke, and had a long conference with him concerning the part taken by Elizabeth in the French quarrels. The letter also contains an account of communications with the Admiral, who was not so discomfited by the issue of the battle, or even the capture of the Prince, as to make concessions. The letter is dated from St. Denis, Jan. 3, 1562-3. It was after this battle that the Prince of Condé and the Duke of Guise are said to have actually occupied one bed. The Prince acknowledged that he never closed his eyes, but that the Duke slept soundly all the night, with a confidence and greatness of soul, which might well incline us to lament that his ambition should have been the ruin of a man capable, otherwise, of passing for a model of heroism.

sent against him, after some slight skirmishes, he laid down his arms, by the advice of his relative, the Earl of Kildare, promising to make a journey into England, to beg the Queen's pardon; a promise which he put in execution this year, and the following is Camden's account of it, who was living at the time, and though probably too young to have seen the sight, yet we may be pretty certain, that the scene, extraordinary as it certainly was, must have passed immediately under the eyes of the *Secretary*.

"Now was Shan O'Neal come out of Ireland, to perform what he had promised a year before, with a guard of ax-bearing galloglasses,\* bare-headed, with curled hair hanging down, yellow surplices dyed with saffron, long sleeves, short coats and hairy mantles, whom the English people gazed at with no less admiration than now-a-days they do them of *China* and *America*; he being received with all kindness, and falling down at the Queen's feet, confessed his crime and rebellion with *howling*, and obtained pardon. Being gently asked by what right he had excluded Hugh, his brother Matthew's son, out of his forefather's inheritance, he answered fiercely (as he had done before in Ireland), 'By very good right, to wit, that he, being the certain and lawful son and heir of Con, as born of his lawful wife, had entered upon his father's inheritance: that Matthew was the son of a blacksmith of Dundalk, born after his marriage with his wife *Alison*, but by his mother cunningly obtruded upon *Con* for his son, to bereave *him* of his inheritance and dignity of *O'Neal*: which though he endured, yet none other of the house of the O'Neal's would ever suffer it. That the surrender which his father had made to Henry Eighth, and the re-delivery which the King made back again to him, by his Letters-Patent, were as good as nothing; forasmuch as *Con* had no estate in that which he surrendered, but for life, nor could surrender it without the consent of the nobility and people, by whom he was elected to the honour of *O'Neal*; for his part he was, by the law of God and man, the certain heir, to wit, the eldest son of his father, begotten in lawful wedlock, and by joint consent of the nobility and people designed *O'Neal*, according to the law of that country, called *Tanistry*, by which a man of ripe age is to be preferred before a child, and the uncle before that nephew, whose grandfather surviveth the fathers. Neither did he usurp any authority over the nobility of Ulster, than what his forefathers in

\* *Gallowglasses*. Heavy-armed foot soldiers of Ireland and the western isles.

*Nares's Glossary*. Macbeth i. 2, 2 Hen. VI. iv. 9.

ancient times, had exercised by their own right, as he was able to prove by good evidence.' Which matters, forasmuch as the Queen gave credit unto, he was sent home again with honour, and for a while performed stout and faithful service against the Hebridian Rovers."

The year 1562 was distinguished by many important circumstances relating to the Church, and its more permanent establishment on the footing of the Reformation. In vindication of which, there appeared at this time, not merely as a private publication, but with the sanction of the College of Divines, concerned in the revisal of the Liturgy, the consent of the Bishops and whole Clergy, the Queen's license, and the approbation of many learned foreigners,\* the famous APOLOGY of the learned Bishop JEWEL. It was written in Latin,† as a defence of the Church of England, which might be read and perused in all parts of Europe in the very original; but indeed it was not long before various translations were made of it, into *French, Italian, Spanish, and Dutch*, and, before two years were passed, into our own language by the hand of a person we are more particularly bound to mention, the sister of Lady Cecil, and wife of the *Lord Keeper*, Lady Bacon. An undertaking so ably and so *correctly* performed, as to have been, we are told, more commonly cited afterwards by the worthy Bishop himself, than his own original Latin.‡ The Apology § being not only still extant, but exceedingly well known to all the learned members of our admirable Church, we need not dwell largely either upon its contents or its merits. Its importance must ever be the same, as long as Protestantism

\* See particularly P. Martyr's letter to him, in Strype's *Annals*, i. 428-9.

† Under the following title: "Apologia Ecclesie Anglicanæ, authore Joanne Juellio, Episcopo Sarisburiensi." It was, some time before its publication, sent to the Secretary Cecil for his judgment, and the approbation of the Queen.

‡ He made use of this version alone, we are told, in his *Defence* of the Apology against Harding. When completed, Lady Bacon sent it both to the Archbishop and the author himself, Bishop Jewel; accompanied in the latter instance with a Greek epistle, which the Bishop also acknowledged in Greek. After a careful perusal of this learned Lady's translation, it was returned to her by Parker and Jewel, without a single correction or emendation; though in reality a prior translation had appeared, printed by Reiner Wolf, in which the Archbishop himself is said to have had a considerable hand. We have, in our first volume, prepared the reader for these efforts and examples of learning, in the daughters of Sir Anthony Cook; but as this version was not actually made public before the year 1564, we may have more to say of it hereafter.

§ This year also a new edition was put forth of Coverdale's Bible.—See Strype's *Annals*, i. 424.



shall continue to be subject to the imputation of novelty. We were careful in our first volume to shew, that the term *Restoration* would have been a better term to express what the seceders from Popery in the sixteenth century were seeking to accomplish, than the term *Reformation*. They were endeavouring not to amend a bad system, but only to tread back their steps to a more pure and primitive state of the true Catholic Church; to cast aside all questionable authorities, and in every instance to be governed, first by the Scriptures, wherever the Scriptures had spoken decisively, and secondly, by the *wisdom* and *practice* of the earliest ages of Christianity. This was certainly the object of the most learned and zealous opponents of the corruptions of the Church of Rome; and though the Protestants, or Reformers (or perhaps more correctly Anti-Papists), fell into parties, as the Papists fairly enough objected, and could not therefore all be right, yet it well deserved the care and pains of a man like Jewel, to pen such an apology for his *own church*, after the manner and example of the ancient apologists of Christianity itself, as *Quadratus*, *Melito*, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and others, and to repel, in his own behalf, as well as in that of all his coadjutors, the charges of novelty, heterodoxy, schism, ignorance, and mischief;\* and by explaining the true grounds on which the friends of the English Church had proceeded, in copious references to Scripture and the earliest Fathers, to submit matters as fairly as could be to the judgment of the world at large,† and at any hazard of convincing or not convincing others, to *justify their own doings*. This was the sole design and intent of the Apology of Jewel. It is still before the public, nor have the answers that were made to it been kept out of sight. Every opportunity of refuting it was afforded to the learned of Europe, by distributing copies in all parts; France, Flanders, Germany, Spain, Poland, Hungary, Scotland, Denmark, and Sweden, not excepting Rome and Naples, to which latter places indeed it seems to have been particularly sent. It is to be regarded as no small proof of its worth and importance, that it fell under the notice of the Council of Trent, and underwent there a pretty strict examination. Two Popish Bishops undertook to answer it,

\* See, for an account of all these several charges, Bishop Jewel's own preface to his Defence of the Apology, 1569; and Strype's Annals, i. 424.

† “Ad *Apologiam* ablego,” says the famous scholar, Walter Haddon, in his Epistle to Osorius, “quem ecclesia nostra tanquam communem et certam nostræ religionis obsidem palam in oculis orbis Christiani collocavit.”—“I refer you to the *Apology*, which our Church has placed openly before the eyes of the whole Christian world, as the common and certain pledge of our religion.”

as well as many English Papists, but it stood its ground against all attacks, and may be said to do so to this day. Though the main object of the book was to defend the principles and practice of the Anglican Church, yet great care was taken to shew, that in many particulars it was in perfect agreement with other Reformed Churches, German, Helvetian, French, and Scotch. There was sufficient proof given of this, by the letter which that eminent Reformer, Peter Martyr, wrote to Jewel but a few months before his death, and in which he undertook, in addition to his own commendations, to answer by name for Bullinger, his sons and sons-in-law, with Gualter and Wolph then residing with him at Zurich.

This letter was written in August, and on the 12th of November following, that learned Professor and Divine, Peter Martyr, died—an event he seems to have apprehended to be nigh at hand, from some passages of his letter: indeed, his infirmities appear to have been great, distressing, and painful—"quotidie onus ætatis ingravescit. Jam a sesquianno sum prorsus edentulus, nec ventriculus officium fecit, ut me appetitu ad comedendum excitet; laboro præterea capitis distillationibus; ad quæ mala tibiærum non leves accesserunt dolores, propter duo ulcera, quibus interdum graviter discrucior." This learned and good man was better known in England during the preceding reigns, especially under Edward VI., when he filled, as we have shewn in our first volume, the Professor of Divinity's chair at Oxford, being exposed there to many rude and unfair attacks on the part of the Papists. He was doomed to bear his share of the malevolent and very unjust censures of Popish bigots; and notwithstanding his great learning, godly life, and inoffensive manners, was compelled to hear himself denounced as "a dotard, a subverted, impudent, and notorious master of errors." "Senex delirus, subversus, impudens, errorum magister insignis," are the foul terms of one of his great opponents, Tresham. Having lived much at Lambeth with *Cranmer*, the friendly and just praises of the latter are abundantly sufficient to outweigh the calumnious, malevolent, and unjust imputations of his enemies. He was an Italian by birth; his proper family name being *Vermigli*; his parents were rich, and of some figure in the world; but having imbibed the doctrines of the Reformists, and even ventured to preach and inculcate them among his associates at *Naples*, he was compelled to leave that place, and, after many removals, to take up his abode in England, 1547. We have had occasion to speak of him at that period of our history, and need not therefore say more, than that living in most trying and hazardous times, he appears to have conducted himself, in all instances,

with singular prudence, moderation, and good sense. We have spoken of Cranmer's praises of him; but the learned *Dupin*, the author of the "*Bibliothèque universelle des auteurs ecclésiastiques*," has not scrupled to speak of him also in terms of the highest commendation, though compelled to regard him as a heretic; or, to use an expression common in those days, a *prétendu-reformateur*. We have noticed in our first volume the barbarous exhumation of the dead body of his wife at Oxford; it deserves therefore to be mentioned, to the praise of Archbishop Parker, Bishop Grindal, and others, that in the very year before Peter Martyr himself died, care was taken to search for and recover the remains of this worthy but unfortunate woman, which had been ignominiously thrown into a dunghill, and to cause them to be decently and honourably re-interred;\* not without very public tokens of respect and esteem, many copies of Latin and Greek verses, composed by the learned members of Christ Church, being on the day appointed for the ceremony, attached to the doors of the Cathedral, in praise of her virtues; a speech also was made upon the occasion; and on the Sunday following, a pious and learned sermon delivered from the pulpit by one of that society. It is remarkable that this considerate and wise act should have afforded the commissioners (for all that took place was under the Queen's ecclesiastical commission) an opportunity of burying also, at the same time, the bones of St. *Frideswide*, which, as precious relics, had, in past times, been applied to superstitious purposes, being on certain days exposed on the altar to receive the devotions of the people. We cannot conclude without adding this remarkable fact, that Marshall, the very Dean of Christ Church, who had caused the dead body of Martyr's wife to be dug up and cast into the dunghill, retracted in the course of the year 1563, and in the presence of the Bishop of London, freely and willingly subscribed the articles of 1562.—See *Strype's Annals*, ii. ch. 36. This was not the first time he had forsworn the Romish religion, having retracted under Edward, though, in his public acts, so great a bigot under Mary.

\* Life of Archbishop Parker, i. 199.



## CHAP. V.

1563.

The Fifth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, began November 17, 1562.

*Parliamentary proceedings—The Speaker Williams' address to the Queen—Subsidy, and proceedings relative to the succession—Reflections on the Queen's marriage and succession—Nowell's catechism—Second Book of Homilies—Disputes in convocation—Queen Elizabeth studies the Fathers—Conspiracy of the Poles—Surrender of Newhaven—Conclusion of the Council of Trent—Jewel's answer to Scipio—Osorius's letter to the Queen, and Haddon's answer—Haddon employed by Cecil—His death—Mary Queen of Scots writes to the council of Trent—Elizabeth's message to the Queen of Scots.*

ON the 12th of January 1562-3,\* the Queen's second Parliament began to sit at Westminster, being opened in great form by her Majesty in person, who was attended thither by all her Lords spiritual and temporal. The new Bishops, twenty-two in number, riding in their robes of scarlet, lined, and hoods down their backs of Meniver.† The *Chief Secretary*, Sir *William Cecil*, appears to have occupied a distinguished place in the procession, between the Knights, Counsellors (whereof his father-in-law, Sir Anthony Cook, was one), and the Peers, preceded by William Howard, bearing the Queen's cloak and hat. Her Majesty's own appearance is so minutely described, as to be worth transcribing. After the Duke of Norfolk, with his Marshal's gold rod, the Lord Treasurer with the cap of estate, and the Earl of Worcester with the sword, came the Queen's Majesty on horseback: a little behind, the Lord Chamberlain and Vice-Chamberlain. Her Grace apparelled in her mantle, opened before, furred with ermines, and her kertle of crimson velvet, close before and close sleeves; but the hands turned up with ermines, and a hood hanging low round about her neck of ermines; over all, a

\* Ann. 5th Elizabeth, 1562-3.

† Strype, and D'Ewes' journal, where the whole form of the procession is to be seen, transcribed from memorials written at the time.

rich collar set with stones and other jewels, and on her head a rich cowl: and the next after her the Lord Robert Dudley, Master of the Horse, leading the spare horse; and after all, other ladies, two and two, in their ordinary apparel. By the side of the Queen went her footmen, and along on either side the pensioners with their axes; then the Captain of the Guard, Sir William St. Loe, and after him the guard. Her Majesty's reception and attendance at the Abbey, to which she first resorted, to hear a sermon preached by Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, before her entrance into the Parliament House, were accompanied also with ceremonies of extraordinary magnificence and solemnity, as may be seen at large in D'Ewes' Journal; but we must pass on to other things.

From the speech of the Lord Keeper, too long to be inserted here, much may be collected of the precise state of the kingdom at this time; whether regarding religion, or the policy of the realm. The complaints he observed were many, of the insufficiency or incompetency of ministers, the want of order and regularity in the discharge of their duties, with no small contempt, in many instances, of the wholesome discipline of the Church. These things he earnestly recommended to the care and attention of the spiritual Lords. He urged upon the temporal Lords a careful revision, and, if possible, a retrenchment of the existing laws, as being, in some instances, too many, thereby occasioning confusion, delay, and unnecessary expense, and of all good and necessary laws, to enforce, to the utmost of their means, the due execution. To the Commons he applied, in the Queen's name, for a subsidy, "not to cover any extravagant debts or expenses, but entirely in defence of the state." Some of his expressions upon this head do the Queen much honour, especially as they appear to be founded on truth. "And where afore this time Princes commonly have had some vein or delight to spend treasure upon, for their pleasure, which the Queen hath none, but only for the commonwealth and surety thereof, so that we may most justly and fortunately say, to her great praise, that the relieving of the realms necessities is our Princes whole delight; and notwithstanding all the disbursements of her late charges, yet she was (as I right well know) very hardly brought to, and persuaded to call this Parliament, in which she should be driven to require any aid, or by any means to charge her subjects, if by any other means it might have been holpen; and so her Majesty herself commanded to be declared. As I for my part, and so do others, very well know; for the Commons little think or consider what a trouble want is to her, whereby she is forced to ask of them (which surely is against her nature); but that she is thereunto forced

for the surety of this realm:" he concludes with recommending to them the choice of a Speaker.

The person chosen by the Lower House, in conformity to the Lord Keeper's injunctions, was Thomas Williams, Esq., who being with all due form introduced into the Upper House, her Majesty being present, between Sir Edward Rogers, Knt., Comptroller of the Queen's Household, and Sir William Cecil, her principal Secretary, after a speech, in the customary form, in depreciation of his own abilities, and receiving in return the strongest assurances, through the Lord Keeper, of the Queen's confidence, addressed himself to her Majesty in a speech of some length, and in which he entered so fully into the circumstances in which the nation then stood, and the policy of her Majesty's proceeding to that time, that we should feel ourselves obliged to notice some passages of it even if it had not been with considerable probability attributed to Sir William Cecil, the *Speakership* itself having been offered to *him*, but declined. The speech certainly bears strong marks of the strange pedantic style of those days; but, upon the whole, there is much in it so applicable to the real state of the nation under the administration, in a great measure, of the Secretary himself (as the Queen's chief adviser), that we cannot omit touching upon a few particulars in reference to the acts and proceedings of the government from the Queen's accession to this time. The Speaker observes to her Majesty:—

"When God planted your Highness in this place, you found it not so furnished with treasure, as other your predecessors have, although if you had, occasions enough there were to employ it; which, notwithstanding, you did not take the extremity of penal statutes, and other forfeitures, due unto you, but pardoned all such, as in time convenient required it. Also, your Majesty did vouchsafe to take upon you the charge of both the states, as well spiritual as temporal, and so purged this Church of ill service, and placed therein service to God's honour. Further, what great plague and dearth happened by ill money, this twenty years last past, which within one year, is brought to good again, with little loss of your subjects? Your Majesty prevented also, as well the attempt in Scotland, made by your common enemy there, as now of late, again in France; which otherwise, if it had not been *foreseen*, would have turned to the no little peril, and loss of this, your realme and subjects thereof." He notices the treaties of peace, concluded since her accession, and adverting to the expenses incurred, observes, "all which former proceedings have been a great charge unto your Majesty, which, although the revenues of your Crown be small, yet hath it



hitherto only been done of your own charge, as the last day by the Lord Keeper was declared. And for the last part, and principal point of all others, your Highness has brought and restored again God's doctrine into this realm."

For the remainder of this speech, we cannot do better than follow Strype, the very author who has insinuated, that probably *Cecil* had a great hand in it. "He took notice of the want of *schools*; that, at least, an hundred were wanting in England, which before this time *had been*; [being destroyed, I suppose he meant, by the dissolution of monasteries, and religious houses, fraternities, and colleges.] He would have had England continually flourishing, with ten thousand scholars, which the schools in this nation *formerly* brought up. That from the want of these, and good schoolmasters, sprang up ignorance: and covetousness got the livings by impropriations, which was a decay, he said, of learning: and by it the tree of knowledge grew downward, not upward; which grew greatly to the dishonour, both of God and the commonwealth. He mentioned likewise, the decay of the universities; and how that great market-towns were without schools or preachers: and that the poor vicar had but 20*l.* [or some such allowance], and the rest, being no small sum, was *impropriated*, and so thereby, no preacher there; but the people, being trained up, and led in blindness for want of instruction, became obstinate: and therefore advised that this should be seen to, and impropriations redressed, notwithstanding the laws already made [which favoured them].\* He took notice also of a third monster, called *Error*, [as *Ignorance* and *Necessity* were the two others that troubled the kingdom.] Under this monster, he brought the Pelagians, libertines, Papists, and such other, leaving God's commandments, to follow their own traditions, affections, and minds: that if the Papist was (and indeed he was) in error, that we should seek the redress thereof; for that the poor and ignorant were abused.

\* The Speaker's expressions upon this point are very strong, as reported by Collier, "The *Impropriations* therefore, which are so fundamental to our misfortune, ought to be restored to the Church, and the laws repealed which lie cross to the redressing this grievance." This passage alone, if the speech were *Cecil's* (and at all events there can be no doubt of his having approved it), ought to be sufficient to exonerate him from the charge of having *encouraged* the spoliations that were going forward, and of having even partaken of them, without *scruple*. We have endeavoured to shew elsewhere, that whatever he got in the scramble, was either purchased, or obtained by grants for tried services, in cases, which if *he* had not taken, would assuredly only have passed into other (and, most likely, much less deserving) hands. Our belief is, that he never regarded such property, in private hands, as at all secure; that he contemplated some restoration, so much so, as to caution his own son against having more to do with it than he could help.

“He moved her Majesty to build a strong fort for the surety of the realm, for the repulsing of her enemies, and to be set upon firm and steadfast ground ; which fort to have two gates, the one commonly open, the other a postern, and two Watchmen at either of them ; one Governor, one Lieutenant : and then no good thing would there be wanting. The fort he meant was, the FEAR of GOD ; the Governor, God himself ; her Majesty the Lieutenant ; the stones of it the hearts of her faithful people ; the two Watchmen at the open gate to be knowledge and virtue ; the other two at the postern to be mercy and truth ; all being spiritual ministers. That this fort was invincible, if every man would fear God : for all Governors reign and govern by the two Watchmen, Knowledge and Truth : and that if she, being the Lieutenant, saw Justice, with Prudence her sister, executed, she would then rightly use the office of a Lieutenant : and for such as departed out of this fort, let them be let out at the postern by the two Watchmen, Mercy and Truth : and then she would be well at home and abroad.” “In this ingenious speech,” says Strype, “I strongly suspect *Cecil* had a great hand.” If this were so, it certainly does him honour. Many parts perhaps of it are too fanciful, and too metaphorical to suit the present taste, but it contains undoubtedly many wholesome and important truths ; truths, which it required no small courage so publicly to insist upon, but which notoriously demanded the royal attention. On the prorogation of the Parliament from April to October, the Speaker again addressed her Majesty, in a style of language much resembling that of his former speech, soliciting her royal assent to the bills they had passed, and begging her to accept from her faithful subjects a supply of one subsidy and two fifteenths, to defray the charges incurred in France, and in the repair of her Northern fortresses.\* The measure of these grants we may conclude to have been prescribed by the Secretary, according to the following entry in the Journals of the House, January the 20th.

\* Camden says, this aid was granted for religion reformed, peace restored, England with Scotland freed from the foreign enemy, money refined, the navy renewed, warlike munition by sea and land provided, and for the laudable enterprise in France for the securing of England and the recovering of Calais. The Clergy gave one subsidy. As Camden in this place explains the *subsidy* and *fifteenth*, it may not be amiss to add what he says of them. A fifteenth he states to be a certain taxation upon every city, borough, and town, not upon every particular man, but in general in respect of the *fifteenth* part of the wealth of the places. A subsidy is a tax levied by the poll upon every man, according to the valuation of their goods and lands ; neither of them being ever imposed but by consent of the Estates in Parliament.

“An excellent declaration was this day made by Mr. Secretary *Cecill*, of the great charges defrayed by the Queen’s Majesty, and of the causes of the wars of *France*, for not keeping the edict there made by the Parliament, and also touching the charges at *Barwicke* and *Newhaven*, the provision of armour, and the navy, the cavillation of the French for *Callice*, concluding to consider for the aid.”

It was in this Parliament, and only about eight days after the above statement had been made to the House by the Secretary, that her Majesty received the petition of the Commons, touching the limitation of the succession; in which much was pressed upon her attention, relating to the troubles that might ensue from a disputed succession, in case her Majesty should be taken from them before she should have issue, of which her late illness, as it was observed, had been sufficient to give them but too lively apprehensions. They humbly besought her to weigh these things in her mind, and either to take to herself some honourable husband,\* or else provide some most gracious remedy against the dangers incident to an unsettled succession, her Majesty being the last expressly named in the will of Henry VIII., and in the body of the act relating thereto; and the nation in much uncertainty as to any further limitations, which left it in “some great dangerous doubt, to the great grief, peril, and unquietness of her faithful Commons.” No sufficient or immediate answer being returned to this petition, on the 12th of February, “the House desired the Privy Council to require the Queen’s Majesty, to have in remembrance their petition, looking for her most gracious answer.” A sort of answer (but certainly no very gracious one) was accordingly sent, as may appear from the following entry in the Journal: “Mr. Comptroller and Mr. Secretary (*Cecil*) declared from the Queen’s Highness, that she doubted not but the grave heads of this House did right well consider, that she forgot not the suit of this House for the succession, the matter being so weighty; nor could forget it: but she willed the young heads to take example by the antients.” No regular answer to the original petition, however, was ever returned to the House, but on the last day of the sittings, the Queen being present in the Upper House, the Lord Keeper was commanded to say, that, “for the great weight of the matter, her Majesty minded to take further advice.”—*D’Ewes*, 91.

\* “In Parliament petition made both by the Lords and Commons, that her Majesty would marry.”—*Lord Burghley’s Diary*, March.



It was certainly a question of no small embarrassment to Elizabeth, though she was, as the petition of the Commons stated, the last person expressly named in the settlement upon Henry's will, yet the Suffolk line had a claim under the statute, empowering Henry to name his successors; and Mary of Scots' claim had as yet no parliamentary sanction whatsoever; on the contrary, in the very petition of which we are speaking, she seems to be spoken of as a *stranger* to the throne. "We have been admonished," say the petitioners, "of the great malice of your *foreign* enemies, which, even in your lifetime, have sought to transfer the dignity and right of your crown to a STRANGER;" and in another passage, great apprehensions seem to be expressed of the advancement of Mary's claim and title, by a party at home. "We fear a faction of *heretics* in your realm, contentious and malicious *Papists*, lest they, most unnaturally against their country, most madly against their own safety, and most treacherously against your Highness, not only hope for the day of your death, but also lay in wait to advance *some title* under which they may revive their late unspeakable cruelty, to the destruction of goods, possessions, and bodies, and thralldom of the souls and consciences of your faithful and Christian subjects." There is a curious speech of Sir Ralph Sadler's to be seen in Clifford's edition of his letters, &c. upon this subject. "*He* regards Mary as a *stranger*, according to the laws of England; he shews how ill the Scots behaved, and how grossly they dissembled, in King Henry VIII.'s time, in regard to the betrothment of Mary and Edward; he adduces instances to shew how unwilling the Scots were to receive a King from England; and argues from thence, how incongruous it would be for England to declare the Scots Queen heir to the throne."—*Sadler's Letters*, &c. vol. ii. 556, &c. Sir Ralph speaks entirely of his own personal knowledge of the disposition of the Scots, and is quite against the *regiment* of any *strange* Prince in England. This speech was delivered in parliament in the year 1563. Had the Queen chosen at *once to cut off or supersede Mary's claim and pretensions*, the opportunity offered her was very striking;\* had she at all chosen, for instance, to bring forward the Suffolk line, or name any other successor; the alternative of marrying any "honourable husband" was equally perplexing. She was a woman of exactly that temper and spirit, that might

\* There was certainly a large party disposed to consider Mary as naturally excluded, being an *alien* born, though Parliament might over-rule any such disqualification, and, in fact, in the case of her own son it was over-ruled; but we cannot deny that Sir William Cecil, as well as many others, considered her as a *foreigner by birth*: we have however said more of this elsewhere.

make her wish to reign alone ; or if she should marry, there could be no certainty of having issue ; she was fond of admiration to excess, and appears decidedly to have had favourites, whom she did not choose to *elevate* to the throne. Mary Queen of Scots was already a dangerous pretender, and it was impossible to calculate or foresee what might or might not be the effects of giving her a parliamentary reversionary title. The parliament itself, from the terms of the petition, seems scarcely to have wished it. We cannot at present quite unravel the mystery of the “old” and “young heads,” alluded to by her Majesty ; but we are prepared entirely to agree with the answer sent, namely, that it was a very weighty matter, requiring further advice. That many of her most faithful subjects and wisest Counsellors might wish her married, can scarcely be doubted, considering the claims of Scotland alone, backed by France. Of *Cecil's* opinion,\* however undecided it may have appeared at times, we have some particular intimation in the following passage of a letter addressed to Sir Thomas Smith, then the Queen's Ambassador in France. “The heads of both Houses are fully occupied with the provision of surety to the realm, if God should to our plague call the Queen without leaving of children : the matter is so deep that I cannot reach unto it, and I pray God to send it a good issue.” He afterwards wrote to the same, that he could not see that any effect would come of the earnest suits made of the three estates to the Queen's Majesty, either for marriage or state of succession. Of Sir Thomas Smith's opinion we shall have more to say hereafter. Ascham's opinion, as given at this very time, 1562, to *Sturmius*, in a letter to that eminent scholar, has been much noticed, as the opinion of a man who had continual opportunities of observing her Majesty's character and the disposition of her mind. Of the two wives of Theseus, Hippolyte and Phædra, he judged her more to resemble the *former* than the *latter* ; that is, to be more of an Amazon or warrior (for Hippolyte was Queen of the Amazons), than of an amorous complexion, which was the character of Phædra.† Ascham added, what seems to have been entirely true, as to the mysterious conduct of Elizabeth, “for her disposition towards wedding,” he assures *Sturmius*, that “neither he, nor none else, could know any thing certain, nor tell what to say.” This is exactly consonant to the account given by Jewel to Peter Martyr : “Regina nostra, magno nostro cum dolore, innupta manet :

\* The Secretary, in one of his letters at this time, complains that he was “so fully occupied to expedite matters in this present Parliament, that he had almost no leisure to attend to other things.”

† Strype's Annals, i. 469.



neque adliuc quid velit sciri potest." In this letter of Jewel, the danger accruing from Elizabeth's not marrying is enlarged upon; he notices Darnley's affinity to the crown, the possibility of his marrying Mary of Scots, which would apparently delight the Catholics; he speaks of the suspected intercourse between Lord Hertford and Lady Catherine Grey, as not being married to each other, which marriage, if it could be proved, would bring their son also into the line of inheritance under Henry's will, and concludes, "O nos miseros, qui non possumus scire, sub quo Domino victuri simus! Deus nobis Elizabetham, diu, spero vivam et incolumen conservabit, id nobis erit satis:"—but we must have done with this subject. This second Parliament, on the 10th of April, 1563, was prorogued to the 5th of October, 1564, and by subsequent prorogations, had its sittings suspended till the eighth year of the Queen's reign, 1566, never having been formally *dissolved* in the intermediate time.\*

\* It was in this Parliament that the Members of the House of Commons were first required, by statute, to take the Oath of Supremacy, enjoined in the first year of the Queen's reign: certain provisions had been now annexed to it, making the refusal to take the oath the *second* time treason. It was only to be demanded of those who were about to enter into holy orders, or take upon them any eminent place or office. The refusal had been made treason before, but only in the *third* instance; the penalty therefore was apparently advanced one degree at least in severity; objections were raised in both Houses, but over-ruled. Of its necessity, Strype gives the following account: "This was the import and sum of this memorable act, which was necessary for me to set down, in order to the understanding the history of the state of religion in this land at this time; the Romish party, and the favourers of the See of Rome, being so dangerously busy, that the wisdom of the nation found it needful to constitute such a severe law, and such extreme penalties against them; and to lay all such persons aside from enjoying any public place or office in Church or state, that would not own the Queen's supremacy in her own dominions;" but the severity of the law was felt and perceived in the highest quarters; so much so, that Parker, the Archbishop, wrote to his suffragans to be very careful how they tendered the oath a *second* time, and desiring that before they did so, he might be informed of the case. He wished them to keep this to themselves, that no undue encouragement might be given by it. He confesses that he had no authority to use the Queen's name in what he was doing, but he wrote at the same time to *Cecil*, to intimate that her Majesty approved the expedient, and was willing the rigour of the law might be diverted, and concludes, by referring the matter to the Secretary's own judgment, who, it is added, "approved his method."—*Collier*, and *Life of Archbishop Parker*.

By this temper, *Collier* adds, none of the Popish Bishops or Clergy had the oath of supremacy offered them, excepting Boner, ii. 485. Boner, according to his custom, disputed the authority of the Bishop of Winchester, who tendered the oath, and gave all the trouble he could; so that, as Strype says, upon the issue of matters, "all this scandal, trouble, and disturbance, had this good Bishop (*Horne*) in venturing to be so hard as to meddle with such a man as Boner was."



The Convocation having been called together at the time the Parliament was summoned, began its sittings also in the month of January, 1562 (or 1562-3), being the fifth year of the Queen's reign; nor were its proceedings of less importance than those of the Parliament, as regarding the settlement of the Church; for it was now that the Articles of Religion, of which an account has been given in our first volume, underwent that revisal which, by a very few alterations, brought them to the state in which we now have them; being reduced in number from forty-two to thirty-nine, and the thirty-eighth, relating to "the Civil Magistrate," so opened and explained, as to meet all the objections raised against it by Papists and others; the business to be propounded to the Convocation\* and Parliament, appears to have been brought under four heads, by the Archbishop, or some person employed by him.

"I. A certain form of doctrine to be conceived in Articles, and after to be published and authorized.

"II. Matters worthy of reformation, concerning certain rites, &c. in the Book of Common Prayer.

"III. Ecclesiastical laws and discipline to be drawn, concerning both the Clergy and laity.

"IV. To procure some augmentation of temporal commodities for the supply of the exility of small benefices and livings."†

The Convocation seems to have been guided in its proceedings by the method pointed out above.

As to doctrine, the Articles, as we have said before, made and constituted by the synod, under King Edward in 1552, were, in the first instance, carefully revised; the alterations, proposed or adopted, may be seen in Strype, Collier, &c.: it would be going beyond our purpose to examine them particularly, especially, after the authors just cited, and the account given of them in our first volume. We have already observed, that not many corrections were judged necessary; the 39th, 40th, 41st, and 42d, were wholly laid aside, as applicable more to certain errors of the times in which they were originally framed and promul-

\* This Convocation had thirty-six sittings in all, but the register of its proceedings was unfortunately burnt.

† As the Speaker of the House of Commons had alluded, in no very measured terms, to the evils incident to impropriations, it was strongly urged upon the Queen, by the Archbishop, in a paper drawn up for her consideration, "That in impropriated parishes, the impropriators should be obliged to augment the livings to a competent subsistence."—See *Collier*, ii. 491.

gated, than the present ; the fifth Article on the Holy Ghost was inserted, and the thirty-eighth enlarged, with a view to obviate mistakes concerning the extent of the power and pre-eminence, or, in fact, *supremacy* of the Sovereign, in ecclesiastical affairs ; plainly shewing the intent to be, merely to secure to the civil magistrate the chief government of all persons and estates, ecclesiastical and civil, in all causes within his dominions, to the utter exclusion of all foreign jurisdiction ; disclaiming all pretence of executing in his own person, the strictly ecclesiastical duties of preaching, ministering the Sacraments, &c. The ambiguous title of Head of the Church,\* which had been misrepresented or misunderstood, during the reigns of Henry and Edward, was not *resumed* by Elizabeth, on her first coming to the crown ; but in not *resuming* it, care was to be taken to guard the supremacy from the encroachments of such as were manifestly disposed to assume a church authority over the persons of princes, if not altogether as absolute as that of the Church of Rome, yet decidedly approaching to a deposing power. “*Quis tandem Reges, et Principes,*” who can exempt Kings and Princes, saith *Beza*, from this not human, but divine domination ; “*non humana, sed divina dominatione,*” speaking of the *Presbytery*. Considering what was passing in Scotland, among the disciples of *Calvin* and *Beza*,† the supremacy of the chief magistrate seemed to require certainly a double guard at this time, to say nothing of the Anabaptists, who condemned all magistracy. Later, indeed, in the Queen’s reign, we shall find instances of a disdain of magisterial authority, by some who stood up for the *Discipline*, as it was called, exceedingly contrary to the laws established.

\* In the reign of Charles I., Archbishop Laud, and the other Bishops, were charged with the forgery of so much of the twentieth Article, as assigns to the Church a power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith. As the decision of the question depended on the existing copies of the *original* Articles, we must refer the reader to Heylin, Strype, Collier, &c., for their judgment upon the case : the Life of Lord Leicester [1727] may also be consulted, for it became at last a question, not so much whether the Bishops had made the addition, as whether the Puritans, with Leicester at their head, had not been guilty of subtraction, by a spurious edition of the Articles, after they had passed the Convocation.

† To shew that the Secretary bore no ill-will to these eminent Reformers (though in many respects their sentiments were not congenial to his own), it appears that after the conferences at Poissy, *Beza* being in some distress, *Cecil* invited him to England, and this very year, 1563, *Whittingham*, who had married Calvin’s sister, was made Dean of Durham, principally, we may conclude, through the interest of *Leicester* and his brother, Lord Warwick, though he had previously been in some disgrace with Elizabeth, for having written a Preface to Christopher Goodman’s famous Tracts on *Obedience to Civil Powers*.—See *McCrie’s Life of Knox*, vol. i. note AA.

Under this first head of Doctrine, besides the Articles, and Jewel's Apology, which was upon a fresh revisal to be annexed to them, we are particularly called upon to notice the celebrated Catechism of Dr. *Nowell*, Dean of St. Paul's, because it is generally admitted to have been undertaken on the express advice of the *Secretary*; and appears to have been submitted to him, both before and after the sanction it received from the Members of Convocation. The Dean is allowed to have made so much use of the Catechism set forth towards the latter end of King's Edward's reign, as to render it probable that he was the author of both; but in his Latin Catechism, he tells us himself, that he had two objects in view; namely, by a careful attention to the *Latinity*, as well as to the *Doctrine*, to assist the youth of the kingdom in acquiring a just taste for pure classical language, from books of Christian piety, as well as from the profane, fictitious, and sometimes impious and impure fables of the poets. The first edition was dedicated to Sir William *Cecil*, as the person, who, by the Dean's own account, *had set him on work*. It was, as soon as finished, submitted to the Lower House of Convocation, and by the hands of the Dean himself (the Prolocutor), attended by Sampson and Day, presented to the Upper House, as unanimously approved and assented to. It was then returned into the hands of the Secretary,\* who

\* Strype has given us the substance of Nowell's address to the Secretary, upon the return of his Catechism to him, after it had undergone the inspection of the Members of Convocation. "He certified him," says Strype, "that whereas the copy of the Catechism, which he caused to be written out for his Honour, came to the hands of the Bishops and Clergy, assembled in the Convocation, and by reason that certain places were by their judgments altered, and that it was interlined, and somewhere blotted, he had caused it to be copied out again, and had sent it him now, not in his own name, as afore, but in the name of the Clergy of the Convocation, as their book; seeing it was by them approved and allowed: and that he would have sent it sooner, but that he thought his Honour to be occupied with certain most weighty public affairs, by occasion, rising and increasing in the mean time, that he could have no leisure to view that or any other book; which great public businesses, seeing they did not so speedily, as he trusted, draw towards an end, but continued and augmented still, he thought it meet, that the copy of the book, at the beginning appointed and dedicated to his Honour, should remain with the same; that when opportunity should serve, he might at leisure have it, and judge whether it were not unworthy, by his help, to be made public by the Queen's Majesty's authority: for how expedient it were, that some treatise of religion should be set forth publicly in the name of our country, his Honour did well understand; seeing the opinion beyond the seas was, that nothing touching religion was, with any authority or consent of any number of the learned here in our country, taught and set forth: but that a few private persons taught and wrote their opinions, without the approbation of any authority at all.

"That for his part, he had taken pains as well about the matter of the book, that it might be consonant to the true doctrine of the Scriptures, as also, that the style might agree with the purity



kept it by him above a year, after which he sent it again to Nowell, with some learned man's notes upon it. We know not why, after this, it should have been kept back by the learned author for so much as eight years, a less term being surely sufficient for mere transcription; yet so it would appear from Strype's account of it, who tells us, that "remaining with him" (the author) "till 1570, it was then again called for by both the Archbishops, in order to the publishing of it, and with *Cecil's* consent (to whom it was dedicated before), being dedicated *now* by the author to the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London by name, and to all the rest of the Bishops, it was printed; and printed again 1572, and again 1578, with this title, "*Christianæ pietatis prima institutio, ad usum Scholarum, Latine Scripta.*" It was translated also by the care of the author into English and Greek. We must, however, add, that some mistakes have been committed in the account above; which are corrected in the Introduction to Dr. Burrows' Summary of Christian Faith and Practice, 1822. It was, it seems, the abridged Catechism, which in 1572 was dedicated to the two Archbishops, not the larger or original Catechism; nor does it appear to have been presented to the Upper House of Convocation before the year 1570.—See p. lxviii. Introd.

We may see, from the above short account of this very eminent and standard work (for it is allowed as much credit as ever amongst Theologians),\* what object the Secretary was pursuing; and how sedulously, though deprived of the help of his *old friends and acquaintance*, the *Martyrs* of the English Protestant Church,† he was bent upon treading in their steps, and reviving the memory of Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, &c.: to their immortal honour, King Edward's Catechism, first published by the King's authority, both in English and Latin, in the year 1553, was more than revived; by the care of Nowell, under the Secretary's direction, it was made the basis of a more extended manual for the instruction of youth; in Jewel's Apology, the public had ample information given them of the grounds‡

of the Latin tongue; and that as the book had not misliked their judgments, whom he did most allow, and also reverence; so, if it might likewise be approved to *him*, to whose *patrociny* in his purpose he appointed it, when he first began it, he should think his pains most happily bestowed."

\* The late learned and worthy Bishop Randolph, to whom the author had the honour of being a pupil, republished it in the second volume of his *Enchiridion Theologicum*, 1792.

† See our first volume.

‡ "*Edidimus nuper apologiam de mutatâ religione, et Discessione ab Ecclesiâ Romanâ,*" is Jewel's own account of his work in a letter to Peter Martyr. Jewel, in this letter, complains greatly of the carelessness of the English Printers.

on which the Church of England had separated from the Church of Rome, and which, therefore, may be said to have a retrospective design ; in Nowell's Catechism, the kingdom was supplied with a complete view of the doctrines of the Church, when, after the interruption of Mary's reign, it had been restored and established under Elizabeth.

It is absurd to consider Sir William *Cecil* as at this time a *novus homo*, or statesman of Elizabeth's days *only* ; he was, in fact, the surviving representative of the statesmen and theologians of former days, and of the first and original Reformers. He was acting, with the aid of his own nominee, the Primate, Archbishop Parker, as a second Cranmer, equally bent upon the full establishment of a Protestant Church in this realm, and equally cautious to have every thing put upon its proper footing. Had not great care been manifested, to go back to the times of Edward, the measures and proceedings of that very short but important reign might have been lost in obscurity, or greatly depreciated ; but it was highly honourable, and bespoke a proper feeling in the Secretary of *Elizabeth*, to act as he had done while Secretary to her amiable *brother*. We discover no indelicate abuse or vilifying of Mary ; no rude denunciations of her infatuated conduct ; but a path is chalked out for reverting at once to the days of Edward. The cause of the Reformation is revived, in the face of all Europe, with a boldness destitute of all malice, but determined to proceed. Cecil must have known what he was about, and the extreme hazards to which he was exposing himself ; the Queen being still surrounded with *Catholics*, and Protestants ill-inclined to adopt all his measures ; but his own course was steady and unshaken : he was already a Protestant of the *old* school, and determined to adhere to it. Jewel's Apology and Nowell's Catechism may afford us a good insight into his principles, though neither of them were quite contented to stop, where the Reformation *had stopped*, under Edward.

Besides the Articles, the Apology, and Catechism, we feel that we ought, under the first head of *doctrine*, to mention the second book of Homilies, which in this year was finished and completed, though not immediately brought into use. We may refer to Strype and Collier\* for its titles and contents, as it would be beyond our purpose to go at all largely into the subject, having in our first volume explained the nature of these public sermons, prepared for the use of the ministry and edification of the people, as indispensably necessary at this time of

\* See also Burrows' Summary of Christian Faith and Practice, *Introduction*, p. xliii.

change and reformation. Bishop Cox wrote a Preface to this second book of Homilies, which may be seen in Strype. The Archbishop appears to have been very impatient to get them out; and as was constantly the case in all such emergencies, to have applied to the Secretary to help him; in consequence of which two editions, and, perhaps more, were printed, 1563, when the Archbishop was about to hold a visitation, during which visitation proposing to revive the ancient hospitality of an Archbishop of Canterbury, he with some humour reminded the Secretary of the spoliation of his see, as applicable to such purposes, requesting that he would procure for him, from some of his friends in Kent, two bucks, not having, like his predecessors, any parks or command of venison. He tells the Secretary, that he applies to him rather than to the Queen, though she had possession of his great park at Broyle, near Lewes, lest he should be asking for something now become too good for the Bishops and Clergy to eat. "Marry, because I doubt in these days whether Bishops or Ministers may be thought worthy to eat venison, I will hold me to my beef, and make merry therewith, and pray for all my benefactors." The Archbishop was a most generous-hearted man, and truly and sincerely hospitable. The expenses of this very visitation he paid out of his own purse, discharging the clergy of their procurations.

In the Christian Remembrancer, December, 1820, I find the letter above from Parker to Cecil, printed as a letter never published before; but it is certainly to be found almost word for word in Strype's Life of Parker, i. 254. There is, however, among those unpublished letters, one from Coverdale to *Cecil*, which I have not seen before, asking him to procure the Queen to remit the first-fruits of the benefice of St. Magnus, in London, which the Bishop, in consideration of his age, had just bestowed upon him. It is of nearly the same date as Parker's, *viz.* February 6, 1563, he speaks of himself as going upon his grave, and not able to live over a year [he died May 20, 1565], concluding, "Heretofore, I praise God for it, your Honour hath ever been my special help and protector in all my rightful suits: if now (that poor old *Myles* may be provided for) it please your Honour to obtain this for me, I shall think this '*enough*' to be unto me 'as good as a *feast*.' Thus most humbly beseeching your Honour to take my boldness in good part, I commit you and all yours to the most gracious protection of Almighty God."—(*Myles Coverdale* quondam Episc. Exon.) There are some letters also from Grindal, Bishop of London, and one particularly in behalf of *Coverdale*, December 20, 1563: "If any comfortable way of living might be



made of it [the vacant see of Llandaff], I would wish it to Father Coverdale, now lately recovered of the plague. Surely it is not well that he, '*qui ante nos omnes fuit in Christi*,' should be now in his age without stay of living. I may not herein excuse us Bishops; somewhat I may say for myself, for I have offered him divers things which he thought not meet for him." [N. B. This letter, therefore, must have been written before the preceding, the date of which, to be more intelligible, should rather have been written perhaps 1563-4.]

This Bishop appears also to have had his eye upon some venison from *Cecil*. "Your warrant in Hatfield Park, or Enfield Chase, might serve my turn very well.—Edm. London."

There is also a letter of gratitude from Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, to *Cecil*, thanking him for having stood forth to "preserve his honesty from malice," [probably in the case of Bourne. See Strype's Annals, i. ch. xxxv.]

He goes on: "Such is the barrenness of this country that it bringeth nothing forth fit to remember you withal: and, therefore, I am bold to present you with an old clock in the stead of a new year's gift, which I hope you will the rather accept, because it was your old master's of happy memory, King Edward's; and afterwards your loving and learned brother's, Mr. Cheeke's; and since his, who thinketh himself in many respects most bounden unto you, whose prayer you shall ever have, whose service you may ever use, as knoweth the Almighty. From my house at Hartelbury, December 28, 1563.—Ed. Wigorn."

Then follows another letter, mistakenly said to be heretofore unpublished, namely, Nowell's letter to *Cecil*, with his Catechism, to be found in Strype's Annals, i. ch. xxxi., and which we shall soon have occasion to mention.

As to what passed relative to the subjects proposed under the second and third heads of the paper of preparatory matters to be submitted to the Convocation, namely, of things requiring reformation, rites and ceremonies, ecclesiastical laws and discipline, we must refer, as in other instances, to the authors who have entered largely into the history of those times, and, with no small labour, recovered all that could be recovered or ascertained of the proceedings of this Synod or Convocation, under the loss of many valuable registers and other documents by fire. The Queen was petitioned to renew the Commission of thirty-two persons, spoken of in our first volume, under the reigns of Henry and Edward, and of the completion of whose often suspended labours we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. Endeavours were made to secure a uniformity of ministerial habits; but upon this and other points of

discipline, there appear to have been considerable differences and no slight controversy. Great endeavours were made to introduce many things different from the establishment under Edward, to which the more sober part were inclined to adhere, as the result of the joint care of Cranmer, Ridley, and other martyrs of the last reign. These, therefore, loudly protested against any such changes; and it seems to have been submitted to the vote. "When they went to the suffrage," says Collier, "they found the *innovators* a considerable number; but, notwithstanding the struggle, the *protesting* party carried it;\*

and thus the ceremonies and decorations continued in their former condition. However, it is plain by the contest, that the *Frankfort* and *Geneva* precisians had no small interest; many of the *English exiles* were willing to reform away the ornaments and solemnity of divine worship, and thought *Calvin's* platform a much better regulation than that of the primitive church; but God be thanked, the majority of our Reformers had a different sense of these matters, and had more learning and judgment, more steadiness and resolution, than to be overruled with noise and novelty."

We have already frequently intimated, and especially in our first volume, how much the questions in dispute between the Reformers at home and the returned exiles, must have depended on the extent to which it was needful to carry the Reformation; or, in other words, what ought decidedly to be dismissed and laid aside as manifestly and notoriously repugnant to Scripture and the practice of the earliest ages, and what, being already established, might reasonably and without offence be *retained*. Not the habits only, or certain points of discipline, but episcopacy itself, is known to have been made a matter of dispute on the above grounds from the very beginning of the Reformation. Those who were for retaining it, therefore, as consistent with the primitive form and model of church government, could not but regard the proposals to lay it aside as proposals to introduce *novelties*. Collier's expression, therefore, in this sense, cannot be considered as too strong, with regard to many things required by the precisians to be changed. They were, in fact, innovations upon Edward's plan, which had the consent of Cranmer, and other most eminent divines, foreign as well as English. The charge of novelty, therefore, might apply to those only who were not contented with the system of things under Edward, wishing

\* By one vote only.—See *Strype's Annals*, i. 504, 505. The numbers, including proxies, being fifty-eight and fifty-nine. Neal complains that the individual who gave the casting vote had not been present at the debates.

to go much farther in their departure from the Church of Rome. Those who protested against these changes were fully satisfied with as near a return to the establishment *under Edward* as could be accordant with the times; but it cannot be denied, that many of the exiles who are ranked by Collier among the innovators, were persons of great learning and piety; their names may be seen in Strype. Nowell, the prolocutor and author of the Catechism, being at the head; their prudence and discretion in what they did may yet be very *questionable*. Most of them, as Cox told them during the Frankfort disputes, had before submitted to *Edward's Reformation*, and why therefore interfere with those who were for its revival, to the introduction of a foreign system and depreciation of that great work of our English martyrs?

Under the fourth head, the exility of small benefices, and the means of improving them, it was impossible for any real friends of the Church and of Religion not to be struck with the evils arising out of the new system of *impropriations*. This species of property stands now so well secured, as such, by the laws of the land, that nothing less than a revolution, the least to be wished, and most to be guarded against, could wrest it from the hands in which it is now vested; but it was at that time a perversion of things extremely to be lamented; it threw every thing out of course with regard to the character of the Reformation, and under a pretence of rescuing the Church out of bad hands, left it, in many instances, so destitute of a respectable and sufficiently educated ministry, as exceedingly to hamper the government both lay and ecclesiastical, and to give to the ejected Papists many fair grounds for reviling Protestantism. If Strype be right in supposing that the subject of this Memoir had a hand in Speaker Williams's address to the Queen on the meeting of Parliament, it must redound to his credit, that he, as well as the worthy Primate, Parker, was disposed to look upon impropriations as the *radix omnium malorum*, as regarded benefices, the service of the church, and the instruction of the people. The Archbishop exerted all his power to redeem matters at this time, but in vain.\* Universal restitution was a measure not to be expected or hoped for; and partial restitution must, in many instances, have been unjust, unless entirely voluntary. Little more could be done than to prevent, as far as possible, by restraining statutes, further spoliations, further waste, and further abuse of church property; to check all simoniacal contracts and engagements, and secure to the working ministry the best stipends they could, with helps to

\* See Strype's Annals, i. 513, 514. Collier, &c.



provide instruction for the people by public forms of prayer, catechisms, homilies, &c. But, indeed, the prospects of any one inclined to enter into the ministry at this time, were so bad, that it was well observed in a paper drawn up by Ralph Lever, touching the canon laws, and designed to be laid before the Queen, that every body was become more desirous of breeding their sons up to be lawyers or physicians than ministers, and would do any thing with them sooner than make them priests.

At this time, and owing probably to the disputes among the Clergy, concerning doctrines and discipline and the practice of the primitive church, her Majesty occupied herself deeply in the study of the Fathers, as appears from a letter of *Cecil* to Cox, Bishop of Ely. Cox's answer is somewhat remarkable; observing to the Secretary, that "when all was done, the Scripture is that that pearseth. Chrysostom and the Greek Fathers," said he, "*Pelagianizant* [i. e. favour Pelagius], sometimes Bernard *Monachizat* [i. e. is for Monks], and he trusted her Grace meddled with them but *succisivis horis*, that is, at spare hours." But, as Strype remarks, the Queen having sufficient learning to do so, had reason enough to look into the ancient times of the Church, being so set upon by Romanists, who bore out themselves so much with Fathers and antiquity.

About this time, a conspiracy was brought to light, or rather was forced upon the notice and attention of Government, in which some of the family of *Pole*, brothers indeed, as *Strype thinks*,\* to the Cardinal, were implicated, with the encouragement and connivance of the *French* and *Spanish* Ambassadors;† both, as it appeared, under the influence of the House of *Guise*. We may see by this, the danger in which the Queen stood, and the need she had of vigilant and and resolute Ministers.‡ The treason of the Poles consisted in a design,

\* They were his nephews.

† The Bishop of Aquila was the Spanish Minister at this time, great with the Poles, and busy to restore the Catholic religion, so much so, as to induce the Queen to desire his recal, but he died in England soon after.—See *Camden*.

‡ To shew how much hidden and concealed danger Elizabeth's Counsellors had to guard against, we may cite the case of Sir Francis Englefield, who being at this time a Popish refugee, had been called home, and neglecting to return, had had his lands and goods seized to the Queen's use; against which he expostulated largely with the Council, professing his loyalty and pleading his conscience; and being afterwards in Spain, he procured the King to move the Queen in his favour. The Queen upon this directed her Ambassador there to represent, that though he had broken the laws, and incurred the forfeiture of his lands and goods, hitherto nothing had actually been taken out of the hands of his own agents, or servants, except a certain provision which the Queen had assigned to his wife, Lady Englefield. Intimation also was given, that had

betrayed by one of their party, to come with a power into Wales, and to proclaim the Scottish Queen; who, upon attaining the English crown, was to marry one of the brothers (Edmund), and create the other (Arthur) Duke of Clarence; to which title it was alleged he had a fair and just right. Camden states that the Prince of Condé when he made peace, was led by the hope of marrying the Queen of Scots. They pretended that their plan was only to do so in case of the Queen's death, which they had been taught to expect would happen in the month of March, by one of the soothsayers, or prophets, so common in those days, and against whom it had been just found necessary to pass an act. The discovery of these practices, which it seemed not difficult to trace to the *Guises*, afforded the Queen a reasonable plea for aiding the French Princes of the blood, and Protestants, against the ambition of that extraordinary family, as Cecil particularly wrote to Sir Thomas Smith :\* but the expedition had no very good effect with regard to England.

Newhaven or Havre de Grace, had been put into the hands of the English, the Queen been disposed to give ear to all the reports of Sir Francis's disloyalty and mal-practices, she should rather have shewn some severity than such lenity and clemency as had been used; and, in truth, such reports were found afterwards to be deserving of all credit; for in the year 1574, a paper actually fell into the hands of Lord Burghley, wrote by Sir Francis himself, communicating to the Duke of Feria, Philip's minister in England, and Elizabeth's great enemy, a complete list of those of her subjects who, being adverse to her Religion and Government, received pensions from the King of Spain, or were suing for them.—*Annals*, ch. xxxvi. vol. ii. where more may be seen of the foreign practices against the Queen, as detected by a special agent, dispatched into Italy for the purpose. Among the resolutions taken at Rome, in consequence of a representation made to the Cardinals by Pius IV., one was, to proclaim a pardon to any cook, brewer, baker, vintner, physician, grocer, chirurgion, or of any other calling whatsoever, who should make away with the Queen; and an absolute remission of sins to the heirs of that party's family, with a perpetual annuity, and to be of the Privy Council to whomsoever afterwards should reign. Another article denounced excommunication and a perpetual curse on the families and posterity of all those of the Mother Church that should not promote or assist, by means of money or otherwise, Mary Queen of Scotland's pretence to the crown of England.

\* "By the Council's letters, ye shall understand, how that a matter of the *Poles*, practised by the French Ambassador, and the Spanish, hath been of late discovered; which although it be of no great moment to be feared, yet thereby it is made apparent how truly the Queen's Majesty and her Council here do judge of that House of Guise; and so may you, as you shall see cause, take advantage hereby to maintain the former reasons, published by her Majesty, for justification of her doings; [in assisting the Princes and Protestants in France.] The process of the trial may be seen in Strype's *Annals*, ch. xxxiii. The parties, by the whole consent of the Judges, were convicted of treason, but pardoned by the Queen.

not merely to facilitate the entrance of the English troops into Normandy, but as a pledge for the restoration of Calais, which was to be made the basis of any peace to be concluded between the Prince of Condé and his adversaries;\* but in the end, after supplying the Prince's party, according to treaty, with many large subsidies, to enable them to engage troops from Germany, and sending over considerable forces to the Earl of Warwick, to assist the cause, they made a peace, without any consideration had of the English. This was highly resented by the Queen, and as Cecil wrote to Sir Thomas Smith, "she meant not to be so abused." After the death of the Duke of Guise, the contest was renewed, but in a very different shape; the Prince of Condé joined the royal army, to compel the English to evacuate Havre; the King was carried thither to witness the siege, Elizabeth being reminded that she had professed to hold it only for the King. The demand of Calais, however, was kept up, both by negotiation, and every show of a most determined resolution to keep the place, till it was accomplished; but a sudden plague† breaking out in the garrison, in the summer of 1563, compelled the Earl of Warwick to give it up, which not long after was followed by a peace.

Newhaven had been in possession of the English eleven months; it certainly was subdued at last by pestilence, rather than by the sword of the enemy, yet the French made great boasts, in which the Protestants took part, much to their discredit. The Earl of Warwick, whose letters to the Council, to the Secretary, and occasionally to the Queen herself, may be seen in Forbes's Collection, appears to have conducted himself with singular patience and courage, under a succession of disappointments and embarrassments, from the first moment of its occupation. As directed against the power of the *Guises*, the alliance formed with the Protestants may be considered prudent, but the hope of recovering Calais seems to have been too readily indulged; it was scarcely to be expected that any French party could be sincere in promising it, or very forward in bringing the contest to such an issue; the Chancellor d'Hospital, accordingly, who was against the

\* See *Strype's* account of these affairs, taken from Cecil's private letters, *Annals*, ch. xxxii.

† This plague, by the return of the troops, was conveyed to London, where it raged in such fury in the month of August, that 1000 died in a week. Towards the end of the year, that is, in the midst of winter, we read of another complaint prevalent in London, through the extremity of the cold, called the *pooss*; which particularly affected the Queen and her Secretary *Cecil*; the latter of whom was so affected by it as to be deprived of his sight, and the Queen herself could sign no dispatches or letters, or attend to any business, though otherwise in perfect health. It appears to have been a very extraordinary affection of the nose and eyes.



Guisian faction, was warm in his address of congratulation to the King, upon the evacuation of Newhaven, asserting that the English by this war had forfeited all title and right to claim Calais. [*Camden.*] The Chancellor, however, should have recollected how disgracefully the Prince of Condé had abandoned this condition of his own agreement.

It was in the year 1563, and the fifth of her Majesty's reign, that the Council of Trent, which began in the year 1545, as we have shewn in our first volume, was brought to a conclusion. It appears to have excited great alarm amongst the Helvetian Reformers, from a letter of Bullinger to Fox, written in March 1563, in which he says,\* “We do extremely lament the misfortune of the most flourishing kingdom of France, this year well near destroyed (who would have believed it?) by the bloody house of *Guise*, that house of Ahab, and we fear worse still. The news is from Italy, that the Cardinal of Loraine, who has entered Italy upon the pretence of going to the Council of Trent, stirs up the Princes there to take arms against the faithful.—The Council of Trent itself is contriving strange things.”

England was greatly blamed for not sending ministers to this celebrated Council, and very naturally charged by the Papists with a fear of having its heresy exposed and confuted. Thus Dorman wrote, and was answered by Nowell; Scipio, by Bishop Jewel; and the Archbishop is said to have been concerned in a cautionary address to the public, against the decrees of the Council, in a work entitled, “A godly and necessary admonition of the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent, celebrated under Pius the Fourth bishop of Rome, in the years of our Lord 1562, 1563; written for those godly disposed persons sakes which look for amendment of doctrine and ceremonies to be made by General Councils.”—The method of the book being to set down the decrees in convenient paragraphs, and then to subjoin observations and answers to each. It may be considered fortunate, that England was blamed by the Romanists for not attending this celebrated Council, since it had the effect of calling forth such answers, as deserve to be regarded to this day as very important historical documents, serving to shew with how much wisdom and consideration the departure from the Church of Rome had been contemplated by the most learned

\* “Dolémus nos vehementissime casu florentissimi regni Gallix, quod *Guisiana* domus sanguinaria, domus Achab, hoc anno propemodum (quis credidisset), evertit; ac calamitosissima subinde veremur.—Ex Italia nuntiatur, lotharingum Cardinalem, qui Italiam prætextu concilii Tridentini adeundi ingressus est, commovere ad arma, principes Italiæ contra fideles.—Molitur mira Concilium ipsum Tridentinum.”

among the Reformists. We cannot forbear giving a short specimen from the answer of Jewel to Scipio, an Italian gentleman with whom the Bishop had been formerly well acquainted while pursuing his studies at Padua.—The Bishop asks, why he should wonder that England sent no ambassadors to that Council, since Englishmen were not the only ones absent? why did he not as well wonder, that neither the three patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria were there? nor Presbyter John, nor the Grecians, Armenians, Persians, Egyptians, Moors, Ethiopians, and Indians came not? For many of them believed in Christ, had their bishops, and were baptized Christians; nor had any ambassador come from those parts of the world, or rather well would he see that the Pope did not call them; and that his ecclesiastical decrees took no hold of them. That it was more to be wondered at, that the Pope should call such men to a council whom he had before condemned of heresy, and openly pronounced excommunicate, without hearing either them or their plea.—Where were the ambassadors of the Kings of Denmark, Sweden, and the Princes of Germany, the Switzers, the Grisons and the Hanse Towns? those of the realm of Scotland, and the dukedom of Prussia? nay, the Pope himself came not to his own council. And what a pride was it for one man, at his own pleasure, to assemble together all Christian kings, princes, and bishops when he listed, and require them to be at his call and not to come himself.—He questioned the power of Pope Pius to call a council, more than any other Bishop.—The ancientest councils, the Nicene, the Ephesine, &c. were called by the Roman emperors, Constantine, Theodosius, &c.

Then he went on to mention the wrongs the Popes of Rome had done us. That they had, as often as they pleased, armed our people against their Sovereigns, pulled the sceptre out of our Kings' hands and the crowns from their heads. They would have the kingdom to be theirs, and held in their name. That of late years they stirred up against us sometimes the French, sometimes the Emperor. That it was needless to rehearse what the intention of Pius himself had been towards us: what he had done; what he had spoken; what he had practised; what he had threatened. That it was fit that councils should be free; that every one might be present who chose to be so, and those who stayed away not blamed, as was the case in former times, as he shewed by many instances. That now-a-days the intent or scope of councils was not to discover truth, or confute falsehood, but to establish the Roman tyranny; to set wars on foot; to set Christian Princes together by the ears; to raise money, sometimes for the Holy Land, sometimes for the building of St. Peter's church;

sometimes for other uses, I know not what, or rather abuses all. That by the very bull of indiction of the Council by Julius III., whoever should appear at the Council, of those who had left the Roman Church, were only to be heard upon their recantation, and that not taking place to be condemned as Heretics, unheard. That we did not fear or fly, but desire and wish for a Council, so it were free, ingenuous, Christian. So that men did meet as the Apostles did ; so that Abbots and Bishops were freed from their oath, by which they were bound to the Pope ; and our men modestly and freely heard, and not condemned before they were heard ; and one man might not have power to overthrow whatsoever was done. That for themselves they had done nothing but with very good reason. They had called a full synod of Bishops ; and by consent of all sorts purged this Church of those excrements which either the negligence or malice of men had brought in. That they had restored all things, as much as possibly they could, to the ancient purity of the Apostolical times, and to the similitude of the Primitive Church. That this was justly in their power to do, and because they could do it, they did it boldly.

Much more may be seen of this letter in Strype, and the whole in the English edition of Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent ; we have selected such parts only as appear to us to contain a fair historical account of the conduct and proceedings of England, both with regard to the Council, as one called by the Pope, and her own synodical endeavours to restore things, as the Bishop states, " to the ancient purity of the Apostolical times, and to the similitude of the Primitive Church." Always considering that in some respects a *similitude* must have been all that could be expected in so different a state of the world, and under such a variety of habits, manners, and outward condition, as the several states of Christendom were then known to exhibit. That absolute *precision*, to which many seemed to look, could scarcely be held practicable under the change of manners and customs, induced by the lapse of time.

Having shewn, from a reference to Bishop Jewel's letter to Scipio, how well prepared the heads of our reformed or restored Church were at that time, to answer all the objections and cavils of the advocates for the Council of Trent and Church of Rome, we shall turn to notice another extraordinary attack made upon the newly established faith of the kingdom, by a Portuguese writer, Hieronymus Osorius, who, in a letter to the Queen, had endeavoured, by libelling the proceedings of her government and people, in the changes that had taken place, to persuade her to return to the Church of Rome. The letter being



written in a good style, and in the general language of Europe, it seems to have been judged almost necessary that it should receive a reply, in the same language, and in no inferior style, but in truth from the pen of an able scholar and powerful critic. Dr. Walter Haddon, then Master of Requests to the Queen, was the person pitched upon by Cecil, who was not long in preparing his answer; which appeared, after being overlooked by the Secretary and Sir Thomas Smith, under the following title, *Gual. Haddonus Hieronymo Osorio Lusitano S. D.*—This reply may be regarded as another strong vindication of the reformation of our Church; and a most able answer to the objections of Romanists in general. Cecil perused it here, and then transmitted it to Sir Thomas Smith, in Paris, to have it printed there, as Osorius's Epistle had been; that such as had read that calumnious writing might also read this, and right and justice be thereby done to the English nation; but it had nearly been lost in the scuffle. The Chancellor of Paris hesitated to grant permission, and Sir Thomas having put it into the hands of the celebrated Henry Stevens to be printed, it was by some stratagem taken from him, and not without great stir on the part of the Ambassador, recovered, and at last printed in 1563, either in France or elsewhere. Strype, in his Annals, has given so large an account of this able performance, that we shall be contented to refer our readers to that very useful work; though from the intimacy known to have subsisted between the learned author and the *Secretary*, the strong interest taken by the latter in procuring it to be written, his oversight and, perhaps, correction of the original, and his implied consent therefore, to all the doctrines and opinions it sets forth, we could wish it were more in our power to do justice to a discussion of such very high importance; it being no less a vindication of the purity and sincerity of design, in all that was done by our early Reformers, in their separation from the Church of Rome, than of the Church itself; as still exhibiting a monument of their great care and learned labours. The author rallies Osorius for fancying that he, being a stranger, could deceive the Queen by libelling her people; assures him, that her Majesty's knowledge and discernment were such, that she could as well teach him as learn of him; that she was equally above being corrupted by his praises or circumvented by his flatteries; that therefore, his labour in that way was quite in vain; for what he called Novelty of Error, her Majesty knew to be Antiquity of Truth. But the controversy was not allowed to terminate here. Osorius, who was now become Bishop of Sylva or Anco-burge, replied to Haddon in three books of severe and bitter invective against

England, while the English Jesuits at Louvain, laboured all they could to deter Haddon from writing any more; endeavouring to intimidate him by a prophetic denunciation of some strange harm to happen to him, if he did not stop his pen; but he was not to be shaken. He answered, that "he stood in defence of his country, and would persist therein so long as breath was in his body;" which, as it turned out, was not long; for he died before he had gone half way in his second confutation of his angry opponent; and as his death occurred in Flanders, from whence he had had the warning given of the danger he had to apprehend, it is but reasonable to suppose, that, according to the temper and character of those sad times, the cause of his death could not escape suspicion.—On his decease Fox continued his unfinished answer; adding much of his own, and in an almost equally good style, being an able scholar. This work was afterwards turned into English, and published in 4to, 1581; "and to every thing that was writ," says Strype, "I make no doubt, *Secretary Cecil* was privy, and all went through his hand, and the writer had his directions; since the work was of such a public import, and he had concerned himself with this controversy from the beginning."

We may judge from the above, how constantly and invariably the mind of the great man\* whose life we are recording, was occupied with the affairs of the Church, as well as of the State; and of the correct views he must have had of the course of the Reformation, and our separation from the Church of Rome, from the very beginning. Contemporary with all the great reformers, English and foreign, we may regard him, under Elizabeth, as the main connecting link between the dead and the living; and as carrying on the great work begun

\* About this time, Sir William appears to have received a very extraordinary letter, from Sir Nicholas Poyntz, giving an account of the death of his mother, Lady Poyntz. This unhappy lady had married a second husband, who treated her so ill, that she was dying of a broken heart, and totally debarred by her cruel husband of all proper medical attendance. And she had reason to apprehend besides, that she lay under the Queen's displeasure; her Majesty hearing of this (probably through the Secretary), wrote her a kind letter, with 50*l.* for medical help; and Sir William himself, wrote her a letter of comfort, sending the whole by a special Court Messenger. The letters, &c. arrived on the 21st of March, when she had almost lost her sight, speech, and hearing, and on which very day she died; but, as her son wrote to Cecil, no sooner had the messenger delivered his message, and read to her the two letters he brought from the Queen and the Secretary, than she recovered perfect hearing, perfect sight, and a perfect voice. She appointed in what order the letters should be answered, and having with her own hand signed the answers, and kissed and delivered them to the messenger, she presently died; with memory, speech, sight, and hearing, perfect to the very last.—*Annals*, ch. xxxvii.

while he was yet but a youth. As we shall have no more to do with the sittings of the Council of Trent, though its decrees will often perhaps engage our notice, we shall transcribe two notes, the one from Jortin's Charges, the other from McCric's Life of Knox; our only object in doing so, being to record facts that, in all strictness, may be said to be closely connected with the history before us.

"Mary Qucen of Scots, wrote a letter to the Fathers assembled at Trent, in which she declared that she submitted herself to that Council, and promised, as soon as she should be in possession of the crown of *England*, that *of right belonged to her*, to reduce the two kingdoms to the obedience of the Holy See. Hence, says Jortin, it may be judged in what manner she would have ruled over us, if she had succeeded in her projects. This was in May, 1563. *Du Pin*, t. xv. p. 291."—*Jortin's Sermons*, &c. vol. vii. 375. The other is as follows:—"In a letter to the Council of Trent, 18th March, 1563-4, Mary expresses her regret, that the situation of her affairs (*hujus temporis tanta injuria*) did not permit her to send some of her Prelates to that Council; and assures them of her great and unalterable devotion to the Apostolic See, '*nostra perpetua mente ac voluntate, in ejusdem sedis observantia et submissione.*' In a letter, January 3, of the same year, she entreats the Cardinal of Lorrain to assure the Pope of her resolution to live and die a Catholic. And on the last day of the same month, she writes to his Holiness himself, laments the damnable errors (*dammabili errori*), in which she found her subjects plunged; and informs him, that her intention, from the time she had left France, had uniformly been to re-establish the ancient religion."—*Life of John Knox*, 1813, ii. 110. He cites Robertson, vol. ii. 108, Lond. 1809; and certain MS. Letters (from the Barbarini Library), Adv. Lib. A. 2, 11.—Mr. Turner, in his recent History of the Reign of Elizabeth, cites these letters, thinking, as he says (p. 16, vol. ii. note 60), that they had not been noticed before. He is very severe upon Mary for her dissimulation, in carrying on such a correspondence, while she was pretending to take a contrary part in her public government. And we must confess we had come to a similar conclusion, before we could have any opportunity of seeing Mr. Turner's work.

In the course of this year, Mary had received some ill treatment from France, her dower had been detained; the duchy of Chatelherault, or revenue thereof, had been taken from the House of Hamilton, and the places they held under the French crown disposed of to others; and they appeared to be the more inclined to slight her in consequence of the death of her uncle, the Duke of



Guise, who had fallen by the hands of an assassin, before Orleans. But as she was upon pretty fair terms with Elizabeth, and some approaches seemed to be making to a stricter union between the two Queens than suited the purposes of the French, the latter\* began to be alarmed at their own indiscreet proceedings. They now therefore suddenly began to take a different course with her, and fearing that, in her resentment of the affronts she had received, she might fall from their alliance, and be friends with Elizabeth, they sent a special messenger to her, as from her uncle the Cardinal, with many flattering promises if she would keep up the ancient amity, and offering her marriage with the Duke of Austria, on whom the Emperor would bestow, if the match took place, the county of Tyrol for her dower. We are particularly told that the object of this proposal was, to render her and the Catholics of Scotland a party to their quarrel.

These are the circumstances that require to be dwelt upon, in the history of this unfortunate Princess, if we would wish to arrive at the real truth. The design of such a marriage was notoriously to draw Mary away from all friendship with England; and no doubt with a further view, still to procure for her the crown of that *devoted* country, should their policy be suffered to take effect. We may ask, was Elizabeth to behold these things going forward without an effort to avert the consequences of an alliance so immediately directed against herself and her country? Were her Ministers and servants to see the danger with which she was threatened, and not awaken her attention to it by putting her on her guard? And how was she to counteract such projects? Certainly by measures, intolerable in private life, and only tolerable among Princes, in consequence of the general understanding, that royal marriages can scarcely ever in the nature of things be regarded as engagements of any free choice; in some shape or other they must have a reference to other interests besides those of the particular parties, and must be understood not only to require the consent of friends, as in cases of private contract, but of *enemies, rivals*, and all who may be threatened by the political consequences of any projected union of crowns, states, or dominions.

To *hinder* the match proposed to Mary by the House of *Guise*, became in this respect, therefore, an obvious measure of defence to Elizabeth; and Ran-

\*. That is, according to Robertson, Catherine de Medicis, who having heretofore done all the ill offices she could to her daughter-in-law, now sought to appease her, for fear she should turn to Elizabeth, whom Catherine both feared and hated. But, says he, Mary laid little stress upon professions of friendship which came from a Princess of such a false and unfeeling heart.

dolph was accordingly dispatched to Scotland, to advise with Mary upon her second marriage, as a step which must eventually either throw her back completely into the vortex of foreign politics, to the discomfiture of all her Protestant subjects, and the great danger of England, or secure to her, perhaps for ever, the attachment of the former and the friendship of the latter.

It may be easy to talk of Mary's being an independent Sovereign, not to be dictated to, or interfered with, by her invidious and less amiable neighbour, but these are not the considerations that should have weight with the historian of such perplexed and unsettled times ; the above circumstances, may at least serve to shew, that she was not so independent, as to conclude, *without interruption*, any firm friendship or alliance with Elizabeth. The message sent to her by the latter, through Randolph, was to the following effect: " Her sister of England desired her to take such a person as might content herself, love her people, and continue the amity with England. The two first were left to the discretion of herself and Council ; but as to her marrying with that foreign prince before said, that Queen Elizabeth disliked of it ; since it was the work of the Cardinal of Lorrain, an enemy to her, and that such a match would endanger the private amity and concord of the two nations, and the advancement of the Scotch title to succeed to the English crown ; and that the states of England had, upon the rumour of this, endeavoured to have somewhat concluded against her ; and therefore Queen Elizabeth advised her not to hazard the present amity, and the future expectation, but if she inclined to marry, to select some such of noble birth, within England, as might, in respect of his country, give assurance to the Nobility and the Commons of future tranquillity ; and so by that means to advance herself to succeed ; which the Queen promised she would further, and that therefore, she, the Scotch Queen, would not respect only the content of her own affection, and the honour of her uncle, that in her first marriage, and by his advices then had hazarded her best hopes ; but have regard to the peace of her people, and the amity with her next neighbour, from whom she had the fairest expectations, which must be done by choosing her an husband within this isle, and not a stranger." The purport of this message from Elizabeth to Mary, was no sooner made known in France, than the utmost endeavours were used to turn her away from any such match as Elizabeth had suggested ; but she was promised, if she would observe the old and mutual respect with France, against her common ancient enemy, England, present payment of her dower and pension ; wines for her provision, without impost or custom ; arms and artillery,

when she should need ; the band and men of [French] guards to be restored to her nation ; her merchants to enjoy their privileges, enlarged ; and her servants (more than before) admitted to their suspended pensions.

“ In this court of faction and want,” adds Strype, “ no sooner was this offered, than enforced to that height, that the Queen was almost distracted amidst the importunity of so many private ends, profit, liberty, and revenge.” This is extremely probable, and should make us cautious how we throw all the blame of Mary’s troubles and perplexities exclusively on Elizabeth and the English Court. Some things, however, were suggested to her by her foreign connexions, which were certainly very fair and reasonable, First, that to marry an English subject, was a match too base and dishonourable for the height of her parentage, estate, and their alliance ; secondly, that if (as was proposed) *Leicester*\* should be offered, it might rather show a good-will in Queen Elizabeth, than a good-meaning ; thirdly, that for strength of her title by Parliament, what one will establish another may revoke ; and fourthly, that to marry in her own rank, would increase honour and alliance, such as might make her neighbours fearful to offer indignity, and enable her to retain her own, and recover her right, if it should be opposed. Of Mary’s perplexed situation, we may judge from this short account of things ; according to the same author, to whose large and correct collections we are obliged to refer so often, Elizabeth’s situation was not more free from difficulties. “ Such opposite counsels,” says he, “ had Queen Elizabeth to encounter ; but the Scotch Queen, for all this, as yet stood firm to be directed by her sister ; referring over this business to a conference at Barwick the year ensuing. These Scotch matters were earnestly pursued by both Queens, the two following years, as shall be shewn in due place.”

The Secretary this year put forth a second edition of Queen Catherine Parr’s “ Lamentations of a Sinner bewailing the Ignorance of her blind Life.” The first appearance of this work had taken place in the year 1548, the period of the Queen’s death ; with a preface written by the Secretary himself, and which was this year also re-published. These meditations expressed the contrition of the royal penitent for having passed so many years of her life in Popery—how many these were, we are not prepared to say.

\* “ She [Mary] imparteth the matter to Elizabeth, who, by Randolph, advised her the same things which I have before spoken of, taking her an husband, and then more expressly commended unto her, for an husband, Robert Dudley, whose wife being one Robsart’s heir, had died of late by a fall from a steep place.”—*Camden*.



## CHAP. VI.

1564—1565.

*Sixth year\** of Queen Elizabeth's reign began November 17, 1563.

*Seventh year* began November 17, 1564.

*Ills arising from Royal Marriages—Different Matrimonial Projects for Mary—Elizabeth proposes Leicester to her—Melvil sent on Matrimonial Embassies—Pictures—Duke Casimir—Archduke Charles—Conduct of Mary and Elizabeth with regard to Leicester—Return of Lennox to Scotland—Melvil's Account of Elizabeth and Dudley—Ceremony of his being made Earl of Leicester—Characters of Lord Burghley, Elizabeth, Mary, Darnley, Leicester, Archduke Charles, by Miss Aikin—Lord Burghley's Letter to Mundt—His Notes of the Proceedings of Scotland—Of Mary's Marriage with Darnley—Lord and Lady Lennox—Lord Darnley—Mr. Tamworth—Sir Francis Englefield's Letters—Duchess of Parma—Netherlands—Killegrew—Lines by Lady Killegrew—Lord Burghley's eldest Son married—Sir Thomas Chaloner's Death—Of Lord Burghley's concise Notes—Account of the Queen's Visit to Cambridge—Her first Visit to Kenilworth—Mayor of Coventry—Letter of John Fox—Hales' Book on the Succession—Lord Hertford and Lady Catherine Grey—Lord John Grey—Hales—Letters from Lady Catherine—Dennum's Letter—Puritans—Cartwright—Sampson and Humphrey—Bullinger—St. John's College, Cambridge—Lord Burghley appealed to in all Cases—Dispute between the Bishop of Winchester and Feckenham—Dominicus Sampsonius' Letter—Books sent to England by the Papists in Flanders—Protest of the People of Antwerp against the Court of Inquisition—Caryl—Letters to Lord Burghley—Dr. Goodman's Application—Strype on the Interview between Mary and Elizabeth.*

BEFORE we go far into the particulars of the history of the two years we are now entering upon, and which, for reasons that will appear hereafter, it would be difficult to separate, we must revert to the unpleasant circumstances attending royal marriages, since, at no period do they appear to have been more fully

\* Camden calls 1564 the seventh year of the Queen's reign, reckoning 1558 the first; but this is evidently wrong for the reasons we have before stated. The first year of the Queen's reign did not end before November 16, 1559; 45 days only before the commencement of the year 1560, according to our common reckoning. This makes 1560 the second year, and 1564 the sixth, and so Lord Burghley himself considered it, as appears from the following entry in his Diary: "Nov. 17, 1563, Mr. Randolph sent to the Queen of Scots. Anno VIto Eliz."

exemplified than during the sixteenth century ; or, to apply more immediately to the work we have in hand, during the long life of Lord Burghley. Much of our first volume was taken up with shewing, how sadly the two neighbouring and now united kingdoms of England and Scotland were brought into collision by the contest and competition between England and France for the hand of Mary, while yet actually an infant, and how fatally for the repose of Scotland the interests of those two great kingdoms seemed to depend on the decision of this case. While Scotland continued an independent, or rather separate kingdom, from England, but much more when, as such, she became more united than ever with France, not only by treaties of alliance but family connexions, the British Isle could but be regarded as a house divided against itself, and the union of the whole, if practicable, must have appeared to be an object almost as much pointed out by *nature* as by any consideration of political expediency. England appears to have been at all times the rival of France, but the former had now begun to be of such importance in the adjustment of a proper *balance of power*, not thought of in former times, as to render it prudent in France, as well as in other continental kingdoms, to look carefully to her aggrandizement by any new acquisitions. Here, then, *began* the sorrows of Mary, as we have before intimated, not from the malice of any individual or individuals directed personally against *herself*, but from a competition and perplexity of political interests, bearing immediately upon the *already divided* country over which she was, from her *cradle*, destined to rule, for the disturbances in the Church, or Scottish Reformation may be said to have begun before she was born.

It would be vain to attempt to conjecture what might have been the result of her marrying *Edward of England*, to whom she was betrothed ; but it is certainly very remarkable, and not undeserving of notice, while we are upon the subject of royal marriages, that, *amiable* and *worthy* and *wise* as that young Prince is generally admitted to have been, *three* of the most *unfortunate female victims* of court policy known in the annals of the world,\* should have been in

\* We need scarcely pass the prescribed limits of the history we are writing, though indeed much past the time of Edward, to find a *fourth* victim of this cruel policy ; we mean the unhappy Lady Arabella Stuart, the history of whose “ loves ” has been so well and so feelingly described by M. d’Israeli, in the second series of his *Curiosities of Literature*, vol. i. Having some pretensions to the throne of England, her hand became an object of *speculation* not only to Kings and Princes, but even to the Pope of Rome ; of course not for himself, but for one of his Cardinals

the way of being united to *him*; Mary Queen of Scots, the Lady Jane Grey, and the Princess Isabella (or Elizabeth) of France, daughter of Henry II. Of the melancholy end of the two first we need say nothing here, as they fall naturally into the course of the history we are writing; but, of the latter, we have to state, that she became the marriage *victim* of the peace of *Chateau Cambresis*, in the first year of the Queen's reign; being united, upon Elizabeth's refusal of his hand, to that bigoted tyrant Philip, after having been betrothed, as it is said, to his own son *Don Carlos*; and, what seldom happens in such betrothments, an object of unfeigned attachment, on the part of the latter: an attachment which became mutual, and brought both to an untimely and ignominious end.\* But to return—

The years 1564, 1565, may be said to have brought all the perplexities about Mary's second marriage to a crisis. We are now able to enumerate the several matches proposed to her, or *provided for her by others*, and to shew, that if Elizabeth thought her own interests gave her a *right* to interfere, *others* thought the same of theirs. The Austrians, being unwilling she should marry *another French Prince* to the aggrandizement of that kingdom, entered into negotiations with the *Guises*, who, being less interested for France than for themselves, were not unwilling to bestow her upon one of the imperial Princes, either the Archduke Charles, or, as some have written, the Emperor's *second* son Ferdinand, for whom they designed to procure the Empire to the exclusion of Maximilian, King of Bohemia.—(*Forbes*, ii. 116.) While Catherine de Medicis, liking

of the house of Savoy, whom he actually *secularized* in hopes of his becoming, through a projected marriage with the Lady Arabella, a *Catholic* King of England instead of the protestant James I. But in proportion as others sought her hand, on the ground of her royal pretensions, her jealous relative James seemed bent upon keeping her *unmarried*; while she, regardless of crowns, scepters, and thrones, scrupled not to indulge an early and more natural attachment, by suffering herself to be privately united to a younger son of the Seymour family; highly deserving of her, but which fond step ended in her ultimate destruction. After a most romantic attempt to escape beyond seas with her attached and faithful husband, they were cruelly separated, herself brought back and committed to the Tower, where she ended her wretched life in a state of distraction. It is very much to the purpose of the observations we have been making on royal marriages, to add the following remark of Mr. Frankland on this miserable case: “Henry, Elizabeth, and James,” he observes, “considered that it was needful, as indeed in all *sovereignities*, that those who were near the crown should be narrowly looked into for marriage.” James seems certainly to have looked as narrowly, and, in the case above, full as unfeelingly into these matters, as ever Elizabeth could have done in the case of his own mother.

\* See, for a farther account of this unfortunate Princess, our first volume, p. 691.



neither to see the Austrians nor the Guises advanced by such an alliance, proposed another of her own sons, Henry Duke of Anjou, afterwards King. But, Philip II., jealous of all *three*, of his uncle the *Emperor*, of the *Guises*, and of the *French*, endeavoured to procure her hand for his own son Don Carlos. Her uncles of Lorraine had previously offered it to the King of Navarre and his brother the Prince of Condé.—(See Mundt's letter to Cecil, Feb. 1563. *Haynes*, 411.) The King of Sweden and the Duke of Ferrara may still be added to the list of those who aspired to her hand, and even the *Cardinal of Bourbon*, “who,” says Sir Thomas Smith, [*Forbes*, 287.] “is no priest.” In every instance, we discover the selfish motives of the *proposers* of these marriages, and their total disregard of Mary's own feelings and inclinations, which were to be conciliated before or afterwards, as the parties might be able to manage. While the above projects then were on foot, to keep her in the interests of her own relatives the *Guises*, or in those of *Austria*, of *France*, of *Spain*, of *Sweden*, &c.; to keep her in the interests of *England*, a negotiation was opened in 1564, the most extraordinary, perhaps, that could be imagined, and one not admitting of any perfect explanation to this day; we mean the proposal made to her by Elizabeth, of matching her with her own great favourite, the Lord Robert Dudley. We have seen what was the purport of Elizabeth's message by Randolph; allusion is there made to the circumstance we have above mentioned, that Mary's “best hopes” had been early frustrated “by the ambition of her uncles,” in regard to her first marriage, and it is strongly pressed upon her, as she would value the future friendship of England, and her prospects of succession to the English crown, to marry the second time “within this isle,” for the peace of both countries, and the better assurance of the state of England in her favour should Elizabeth die without issue. But, the offer of Lord Robert is altogether inexplicable to this day; Randolph had, at first, a secret commission to propose it to *Murray* and *Lethington*, at which time also, Sir James Melvil has told us in his Memoirs, that *he* was applied to by Randolph to forward the marriage with the Queen as meetest of all other. Melvil had been the very person previously pitched upon to make himself acquainted with the Archduke Charles of Austria, when the project was on foot to make a match between the latter and Mary. Lethington had, by command of Mary, expressly written to him, being then in Germany, to inform himself of the Archduke's “religion, his rents, and his qualities, his age and stature, and desired to send his picture\* if it could be done.” Of Melvil's inter-

\* Melvil was in the way to become a general commissioner, as it would seem, for the conveyance of these royal matrimonial portraits. When Charles of Austria, the brother of Maxi-

view and conference upon this subject with the Archduke's brother Maximilian, King of the Romans, with whom he was invited to tarry twenty days, a curious account is to be seen in the Memoirs, but which it is not necessary to enter upon here, except to observe, which is certainly very noticeable, that Maximilian appeared to be against his *brother's* marriage with Mary, for fear, that *thereby* becoming in her right *King of Scotland and England*, he might be tempted to usurp the Netherlands. Whether this disposition on the part of Maximilian occasioned Melvil to be no very warm advocate for the Archduke at Mary's Court, certain it is, that, in his way home through England, he learned from Elizabeth's own mouth all that was afterwards communicated to Mary, Murray, Lethington, and himself, by Randolph; namely, the great desire of Elizabeth to have her marry "within the isle," and some nobleman of high birth—which turned out to be Leicester. To add, however, to the complication of these matrimonial projects, Elizabeth chose herself to look after the Archduke Charles again, and opened a negotiation the most strange that could be, if she had really no design to marry him; even the Emperor and the Archduke seem to have distrusted her so much, that when first proposed to them by the Duke of Wirtemburgh,\* the Emperor wrote

milian was proposed to Mary, the daughter of the Emperor was sought for the young King Charles. IX. of France, and Melvil was charged by the Emperor Ferdinand with the Princess' picture to be delivered to Charles; which was accordingly done, while the French Court was at Paris; and, as Melvil writes, he found the young King so very desirous to see the picture, that he cut the thread himself that bound the wax-cloth on it. After this, returning to the Court of the Elector Palatine, being called home to Scotland, Prince Casimir, the Elector's son, took occasion to desire him, on his way to Scotland, to take his (Casimir's) picture to Queen Elizabeth. This commission he also undertook, only requesting that he might have also the pictures of his father and mother and all his brothers and sisters, with a letter from the Elector to procure him audience of Elizabeth. Supplied with all these things, he set off for England, and being arrived, was soon admitted to an interview with the Queen, to whom, having discoursed largely of the worth of the Elector and his family, he intimated that he had been presented with all their pictures. "So soon as she heard this," he writes, "she inquired if I had the picture of the Duke Casimir, desiring to see it; and when I alleged I had left the pictures in London, she being then at Hampton Court, and that I was ready to go on upon my journey, she said I should not part till she had seen all the pictures: so the next day I delivered them all to her Majesty, and she desired to keep them all night, and she called upon my Lord Robert Dudley to be judge of Duke Casimir's picture, and appointed me to meet her the next morning in the garden, where she caused to deliver them all unto me, giving me thanks for the sight of them." The Duke's picture made no favourable impression upon Elizabeth, so Melvil wrote to dissuade him from meddling any more with that marriage, who wisely returned him thanks for his pains, and consoled himself by an immediate union with the eldest daughter of the Elector of Saxony.

\* The Duke of Wirtemburgh was the person through whom Mundt seems to have communi-

to him very sensibly, that neither he nor his son were very willing to expose themselves afresh to any such disappointment as they had already experienced. The Emperor's expressions, as copied in a letter from Mundt to *Cecil* in Haynes's Collection, are very curious: "Et tametsi hoc tempore nos in eandem actionem intromittere velimus, tamen, ex eo quod prius evenit, eandem curam similis successus subire cogere: cum et hoc tempore similes causæ et occasiones incidere possunt: quod ut existimationem nostram gravaret, ita nos *deridiculos* faceret, adeoque neque nos, neque filius noster hactenus ullas cogitationes de hoc connubio habuimus, neque modo multum intendimus eam causam ulterius proseguire, sed eam ita linquere."

As the Emperor died not many months after, and we shall have more to say upon the subject, when the interruption occasioned by his death ceasing, the matter was resumed, we shall return to our account of what was passing in Scotland. The problematical offer of Leicester, was not in any haste rejected by Mary; Elizabeth pretended that she had made him an Earl, on purpose to qualify him the more for so high an honour: both Queens appointed Commissioners to treat of the affair, and the Earl of Bedford, Governor of Berwick, was directed to confer with Murray and Lethington. In the mean while it would be difficult to fathom the designs of any of the parties. In June, 1564, Mary appears to have declined meeting Elizabeth unless she could be declared heir apparent; this very thing seems to have been made a condition by Elizabeth of her marrying Leicester.\* To attain this grand object, may, therefore,

cated with the Emperor Ferdinand, which may help to explain what appears to have puzzled other authors, namely an offer made by that Prince to Elizabeth about the year 1563, of his services, in case she were minded to marry. "It might be curious," says Miss Aikin in her Court of Elizabeth, "to inquire of what nature the *assistance* politely proffered by the Duke in this matter, and favourably received by her Majesty, could be; it does not appear that he tendered his own hand to her acceptance." Mundt's correspondence with *Cecil*, in Haynes, seems very well to explain it.

\* If the offer of Leicester can be explained, perhaps we have no better clue to go by than Elizabeth's own account of her purposes, in conference with Melvil; "She esteemed him," [Leicester] as she told Melvil, "as her brother and best friend, whom she would have herself married had she ever minded to have taken a husband, but being determined to end her life in virginity, she wished that the Queen her sister might marry him, as meetest of all other with whom she could find in her heart to declare her second person, [*i. e.* heir apparent, or presumptive.] For being matched with *him*, it would best remove out of her mind all fears and suspicions to be offended by any usurpation before her death; being assured that he was so loving and trusty, that he would never permit any such thing to be attempted during her time."



have been a motive with Mary to listen to the proposal of Leicester, and she certainly must have given room to Randolph to think so, for his letters to *Cecil* plainly signify, that she had an inclination to marry him; still, negotiations were on foot for the return of Lennox to Scotland, sanctioned both by Murray and Lethington. That nobleman appears to have arrived at Edinburgh, Sept. 27, and on the 27th of Nov. following, to have asked permission for his son, Lord Darnley, to join him there; who did not, however, arrive till Feb. 13, 1564-5. On Feb. 5, it seems, Randolph had written to England, giving pretty strong intimation that Mary *would accede* to the marriage with Leicester, and yet on March 20 following, about five weeks only after Darnley's arrival, it became almost clear that she would marry the latter. It can scarcely be doubted, therefore, that there was deception on both sides, as far as regarded the two Queens. Elizabeth, perhaps, meant to deceive in proposing Leicester, and Mary, perhaps, meant only to humour the deception till she could obtain Darnley; as to Leicester's feelings upon the occasion, they are as inexplicable as any other circumstances attending the negotiation, but we know from Sir James Melvil, that he threw the blame upon *Cecil*, his "secret enemy," as he called him; but as this was notoriously said to excuse himself, through Melvil, to the Queen of Scots, and knowing his power of dissimulation, we may well question its truth;\* especially, as *Cecil* was at the very same time engaged in

\* Melvil's account is as follows:—"The next day, my Lord of Leicester desired me to go down the river in his barge with him to London, he had in his company Sir Henry Sidney, deputy of Ireland; by the way my Lord entered familiarly into discourse with me, alledging that he was well acquainted with my Lord of Murray, Lidington, and my brother, Sir Robert; and that he was by report so well acquainted with me, that he durst upon the character he had heard of me, desire to know what the Queen my mistress thought of him, and the marriage that Mr. Randolph had proposed. Whereunto I answered very coldly, as I had been by my Queen commanded. Then he began to purge himself of so proud a pretence, as to marry so great a Queen, declaring he did not esteem himself worthy to wipe her shoes; declaring that the invention of that proposition of marriage proceeded from Mr. *Cecil*, his secret enemy. For if, says he, I should have appeared desirous of that marriage, I should have offended both the Queens, and lost their favour. He intreated me to excuse him at her Majesty's hands, and to beg, in his name, that she would not impute that matter to him, but to the malice of his enemies."

Now if this were all true, the scene described by Melvil in the *following* passage of his Memoirs would afford a most curious subject for a painter. "She [Queen Elizabeth] took me to her bedchamber, and opened a little cabinet wherein were divers little pictures wrapped within paper, and their names written with her own hand upon the papers. Upon the first that

another negotiation for Elizabeth, in which Leicester had some concern, but in regard to which, Elizabeth's *real* sentiments appear to have been impenetrable to *Cecil*, as well as to others; we allude to the business of the Archduke Charles, mentioned above. It was not at all the character of *Cecil* to undermine his enemies, in the way Leicester would have insinuated; we have a remarkable testimony to produce in his favour, which may well support him against the calumnies of Leicester.

"The private character of *Cecil*," says the author of the Court of Elizabeth, "was in every respect exemplary and truly amiable—he was honourably distinguished through life by an ardour and constancy of friendship rare in all classes of men, but esteemed peculiarly so in those whose lives are occupied amid the heartless ceremonials of Courts and the intrigues of Princes. His attachments, as they never degenerated into the weakness of favouritism, were as much a source of benefit to his country, as of enjoyment to himself: for his friends were those of virtue and the state, and there were few among the more estimable public men of this reign who were not indebted either for their first introduction to Elizabeth, their continuance in her favour, or their restoration to it when undeservedly lost, to the generous patronage or powerful intercession of *Cecil*."\*

When Elizabeth explained her intentions to Melvil as has been before shewn, Leicester might probably be present, or at least must be supposed to have been acquainted with her purposes, for Melvil thus continues to give an account of the whole scene: "And that the Queen my mistress might have the higher esteem of him [Dudley] I was required to stay 'till I should see him made Earl of Leicester and Baron of Denbigh, which was done at Westminster with great solemnity."†—The ceremony being over, "then she turned, asking of me, how

she took up was written, 'My Lord's picture,' I held the candle and pressed to see that picture so named, she appeared loath to let me see it; yet my importunity prevailed for a sight thereof, and I found it to be the Earl of Leicester's picture. I desired that I might have it to carry to my Queen, which she refused, alledging that she had but that one picture of his; I said, your Majesty hath here the original, *for I perceived him at the furthest part of the chamber, speaking with Secretary Cecil*."

\* Aikin's Court of Elizabeth, i. 237.

† With the Barony of Denbigh he received great grants of lands there, and in the preceding year, 1563, the Manor and Castle of Kenilworth had been bestowed on him in fee, the Patent bearing date, Sept. 6, 1563, it had been long vested in the Crown. The charges of the improvements he made in the Castle, Park, and Chase, are said to have amounted to 60,000*l*. an immense

I liked him?—I answered, that as he was a worthy servant, so he was happy who had a Princess that could discern and reward good service. Yet, said she, you like better of yonder long lad, pointing towards my Lord Darnley, who, as *nearest prince of the blood*, did bear the *sword of honour that day* before her.”\*

By Melvil’s *own* account, he was fully *prepared to cheat and deceive* Elizabeth upon this occasion, and even as it would appear, instructed so to do. “My answer was,” says he, “that no woman of spirit would make choice of such a man, who more resembled a woman than a man; for he was handsome, beardless, and lady-faced.—I had no will,” he adds, “that she should think that I liked him, or had any eye or dealing that way. Albeit I had a *secret* charge to deal with my Lady Lennox, to endeavour to procure liberty for him to go to Scotland (where his father was already), under the *pretext* of seeing the country, and conveying the Earl his father back again to England.”

It is seldom that those “privileged spies,” ambassadors, let us so easily into their secrets; here Melvil acknowledges that he was practising deceit against Elizabeth. We can find in our hearts to forgive him, if Elizabeth were really seeking at the same time to deceive his mistress, Mary; but it is well for the purposes of our history, and the credit of Elizabeth and her great Minister *Cecil*, to shew that deceitful practices were never wanting on Mary’s part. She knew the game she was playing, and though Elizabeth, by opening fresh negotiations with Charles of Austria, on her own account, and making a show of surrendering Leicester to her, might reasonably enough awaken her resentment,† yet it was

sum in those days. It is rather remarkable, that in the account preserved of the ceremony, though the presence of the French Ambassador is mentioned, there is nothing said of Melvil nor of Lord Darnley.—See *Strype’s Annals*.

\* These honours conferred so rapidly upon Leicester, can scarcely have been the work of *Cecil*, and as they were so pointedly connected with the offer of his person to Mary, would seem to clear the Secretary of Leicester’s imputations. We are inclined to think Leicester was at the bottom of all, and the only person really acquainted with Elizabeth’s views and designs; we have shewn what she acknowledged to *Melvil* of those views and designs, and it is not impossible that Leicester might look to the having *both Queens* wholly under his influence.

† If Elizabeth had really designed to marry the Archduke, there was nothing so very treacherous in her taking this opportunity of reviving the negotiation, since we know, from Maximilian’s own conduct, that he was afraid of his brother’s marrying Mary, for fear of his *invading* the *Netherlands*, when he should have become by that marriage King of *England*. Surely if he looked to have *England*, Elizabeth might as well confer it upon him by marrying him herself, as allow Mary to do so. The Guises appear constantly to have offered *England*, when they offered Mary; as in



no bad policy in her to catch at Darnley ; and it is extremely probable that, in doing so, she was acting still under the advice of her relatives in France, and with the consent of all the Catholic party. In the whole of this negotiation, we are *disposed* to think, that those most accused of deception, and not perhaps without reason, were the persons most deceived in the end—we mean Elizabeth, Cecil, Leicester, and even Murray and Lethington. Whatever Elizabeth's design might be in proposing Leicester, Mary certainly entertained the offer, until, as it is supposed, she excited some alarm in the breast of Elizabeth, that her rival was about to supplant her in the affections of her minion, for so we must call him. If Elizabeth did at any time really propose to act upon the principle she avowed to Melvil, of marrying Mary (as heir apparent) to a husband who would not disturb her own reign, Mary seems to have been playing a different card, by inviting Lennox to return, with a view, in all likelihood, to get Darnley to Scotland also. Cecil, Murray, and Maitland (Lethington), in the mean while, were induced to favour Lennox's return, the two latter especially, as supposing him to be a good counterpoise to the *Hamiltons*, who were become objects of suspicion to the *reformed* party ; while in fact it is extremely probable that the whole was a concerted scheme of the House of *Guise*, to get into their power the *nearest Prince of the blood*, as Melvil calls Darnley, that he might not be set up against Mary, or intercept her views, upon the English crown. We are also disposed to think that Elizabeth, in proposing Leicester, might have in view the checking or suppressing of some rude speeches current against her reputation, on the score of her marked attentions to him ; and in this perhaps *Cecil* may have concurred,\* since it is a remarkable fact, that only twenty-two days before Dudley was made Earl of Leicester, in the presence of Melvil (to give him a higher rank as Mary's suitor), *Cecil* wrote, by the Queen's command, a letter to her agent in Germany, *Mundt*, who was negotiating the match with Charles of Austria, to assure him that Elizabeth only regarded Leicester for his merits, without any design of *marrying* him, or *inclination of that sort*. That these were precisely *Cecil's* own

the case of the King of Navarre, the Archduke Charles, and the Prince of Condé : nor should the arbitrary manner in which they were accustomed to propose the hand of their niece to foreign Princes be overlooked ; she was regularly offered as the *price* of *some new alliance*, and the prospect of her inheriting or conquering *England* generally thrown into the scale.

\* In a very curious paper drawn up in 1566, and of which we shall have to speak, marked in Haynes as from a minute by Secretary *Cecil*, among the reasons against the Queen's marrying Leicester, the second is, "It will be thought that the slanderous speeches of the Queen with the Earl have been true."

sentiments we cannot pretend to say; he seems not to have been quite willing to make himself responsible for them, the letter being carefully marked, as written by command, "*Jussu Reginae*," and a desire expressed in a postscript to have it returned. "*Quæso ut has ipsas ad me literas tuto remittas, itaque facies rem pergratam.*" This letter is dated September 8, 1564, and on September 29, in the same year, we learn from Lord Burghley's own notes, that the Lord Robert, (as he was commonly called) was made Earl of Leicester at Westminster, in the manner so curiously described by Melvil. [See his Memoirs, p. 94.]

As our own interpretation of this extraordinary transaction has been chiefly drawn from Lord Burghley's own notes, compared with his letters published by Haynes, from the Salisbury papers, we shall, for the sake of the dates, transcribe such as apply to this particular subject, as they stand in order in the originals.

1564—Anno VIto. Eliz. :—

"June 4. The Scots Queen refused to meet with the Q. Majesty in England, except she might be by the Parliament stablished heir apparent, or adopted daughter to the Q. Majesty.\*

"June 20. Mr. Randolph came from Scotland.

"July 5. The Q. Majesty being at Mr. Sackville's, wrote to the Q. of Scots to stay the going to Scotland of the Earl of Lenox.†

"July 13. The Earl Murray writeth that he would not have the Lord of Lenox coming stayed;‡ and Ledyngton writeth, that the Earl of Murray and he have been funderers of his home coming."

\* There is a duplicate of this note, as of many others, to the following effect:

"June 4. The Queen of Scotts with excuses, refused to meet with the Q. Majesty.

† The two following notes relate to his family, but, considering what was passing, they are too curious to be omitted:

"July 1, 1564. My daughter Elizabeth (afterwards Countess of Derby) born at Cecill House at night betwixt seven and eight."

"July 6. My daughter Elizabeth christened by the Q. Majesty and Lady Lenox, [i. e. as Sponsors]. The same night the Queen supped at my house."

It is strange to read these accounts, and consider the terms upon which Elizabeth and Lady Lennox, and we may add, Cecil stood, with regard to the affairs of Scotland.—Lady Lennox only two years before [1562] had been in custody for holding a *secret* correspondence with Mary Queen of Scots, and she was at this very time, probably, guilty of a like offence.

‡ Before the union of the crowns, no subject of one kingdom could pass into the other without the permission of both Sovereigns.

Here things seem to have been pretty much at a stay till September, the Queen in the interim having paid her visit to Cambridge, as will be shewn hereafter.

"Sept. 18. L. Ledyngton mislyketh that any fault should be found with the E. of Lenox home coming.

"Sept. 27. The Earl of Lenox arrived at Edinburgh.\*

"Sept. 28. The Queen of Scots by her letters promiseth to restore the Earl of Lenox to his possessions.

"Sept. 29. Lord Robert Dudley made Earl of Leicester.

———— Mr. Melvyn was sent with Letters from the Q. of Scots to the Q. Majesty.

"Oct. 7. Mr. Randolph departed towards Scotland with charge to find lack in the Q. of Scots for not answering of her Letters.

"Oct. 24. Mr. Rand. writeth how he has spoken with the Q. of Scots in the matter of her marriage.

"Nov. 3. Ran. writeth that the Queen is content to appoint the Earl Murray and Ledyngton to come to Barwick to join and confer with the Earl of Bedford.

"Nov. 7. Randolph persuadeth a great likelihood of good-will in the Queen of Scots to my Lord Robert.

"Nov. 12. My Lord Darnlies going denied by the Queen. Randolph came to Barwick.

"Nov. 18.† Earl Murray [and] Lord Lyddington came to Barwyk, and there treated for the marriage of their Queen, where they desired to know what advancement should be made with the Earl of Leicester, and being but answered generally they could not allow.‡

"Nov. 23. They end the Treaty, and the two lords of Scotland promise to make report to the Queen.

"Dec. 2. The Queen of Scots offereth to be wholly directed in marriage by the Erl Murray and Lord Lyddyngton.

\* Duplicate to the same effect.

† "Anno 7<sup>mo</sup> Eliz. the 7th year. From Nov. 17, 1564, to Nov. 16, 1565."

‡ Duplicate. "Anno 7<sup>mo</sup> Nov. 18. Earl of Murray and Lyddyngton came to Barwyk, there treated with the Earl of Bedford and Mr. Randolph.

"Nov. 27. The Earl of Lenox being in Scotland with the Queen's licence, made suit to have his son the Lord Darnley to come thither to him in Scotland."



“Dec. 3. The Erl Murray and Lyddington write to W. Cecill, that they would gladly know, whether the Q. Majesty meaneth the marriage of the Erl of Leicester with the Queen their Sovereign, so as her honour and surety be provided for. Earl of Lenox restored by Parliament.\*

“Dec. 14. A report made by the Earl of Lenox, that he hoped his son should marry the Queen.

“Dec. 16. I, W. Cecill, wrote by the Queen’s commandment to the Earl Murray and Lord of Lyddington, about this time the Queen was sick at Westminster.

“Dec. 24. It appeareth that the Queen of Scots† would have her title declared and established by Parliament.

“January 11. [1564–5]. I, W. Cecill, by the Queen’s commandment wrote to the Earl Murray and Lyddington, that the Queen my Sovereign was first provoked to give advice in the marriage, and secondly, to offer privately her friendship.—I was motioned by Mr. Randolph to go to Berwick to confer with the Lords.

“Feb. 5.‡ Mr. Randolph writeth at length of the Q. of Scots allowance of my Lord of Leicester; and giveth great appearance of success in the marriage.§

“Feb. 13. Lord Darnley arrived at Edinburgh.

“— 16. He came to the Queen.

“March 4. Randolph writeth that the Queen of Scots requireth to be heir apparent of England.

“March 5. The Queen’s Majesty writeth to Mr. Randolph to offer to the Queen of Scots all gentleness, &c. but not to meddle with her title ’till she shall be married herself, or shall determine not to marry.

“March 14. Mr. Randolph writeth that the Queen’s desire is, to be either

\* “Dec. 9. The Q. Majesty sore sick.”

† This deserves attention, as another instance of the imprudent (not to say indelicate and unfeeling) advantage Mary was disposed to take of any illness affecting Elizabeth.

‡ “Nota, a noyse of armed men heard in the streets of Edinburgh in the night without seeing any person.” [This was consistent with the superstition of those days, from which Lord Burghley was certainly not entirely free.]

§ Duplicate. “Feb. 5. Mr. Randolph writ from Scotland of the Queen of Scots inclination to marry with the Earl of Leicester.”

heir apparent, daughter adopted, or sister to the Queen of England.\*—He noteth in the Queen of Scotts marvellous love to the Q. Majesty.

“March 15. Earl Bothwell returned into Scotland. The Lord Darnley is favoured of the Queen and much doubted therein.

“March 20. Lykhood that the Q. of Scotts will marry the Lord Darnley.”

Hitherto it is decidedly our opinion, that a considerable deception was practising against Elizabeth, if not also against Murray and Lethington, who could not possibly have wished Mary to marry a youth of eighteen, and if not a decided Catholic, as some say, by no means friendly to the Protestants, nor likely therefore to be favourable to Murray, though in all likelihood the latter may have been led to promote the return of Lennox, as a counterpoise to the Duke of Chatelherault, who was become an object of suspicion. But we shall continue our selection from *Cecil's* own notes, to the Queen's marriage with Darnley, which took place July 29, 1565.

“*Ultimo* March. The Earl Bothwel licensed to depart by England into France.

“April 7. Earl of Murray departed from the Court [of Scotland]. Lord of Lyddington in some readiness to come hither. Lord Darnley sick of the measles at Stirling.

“April 15. Plainly discovered † that the Queen will have the Lord Darnley. Lord of Leddyngton at Barwick.

“April 30. Lyddington came to England to motion the Queen's allowance for the Lord Darnley's marriage.

\* “Dec. 16, 1564. Wrote to Murray and Maitland that if she married Leicester she should be declared heir apparent after Elizabeth herself should be married.”

† The words “*plainly discovered*” may refer to the fact of Randolph's having been deceived by Mary's good management; his letters to the Court at this period, as Robertson observes, shewing that the intrigue between Mary and Darnley had eluded his discovery and observation, and that he did not know it, till Mary had actually dispatched Maitland, as Lord Burghley's duplicate states it, “to motion the Queen's allowance for the marriage.”—See *Robertson*, i. 194. b. iii. anno 1565. But it is rather difficult to reconcile his ignorance in April, of what Cecil seems to have known in March, namely, of the “likelihood of the Queen's marrying Darnley,” see his notes, March 15 and 20; nor does it seem to agree with Mary's sudden attachment to Darnley, which Robertson believes and relates; though he admits that there was no small degree of spite to Elizabeth, and resentment, in the haste she manifested to conclude the marriage. Mademoiselle de Keralio, who thinks Randolph was deceived, or at least puzzled, as to the intentions of both Queens respecting Leicester, says, “D'ailleurs la conduite de Marie prouve incon-

“April 23. A consultation was had here upon the Lord of Lyddington’s coming hither.

“April 24. Sir Nicholas Throgmorton\* sent to Scotland to labour the dissolution of the intended marriage with Lord Darly, [MS.] and to prefer the marriage with the Earl of Leicester.”

We cannot avoid making a pause here, to throw in one observation. Sir Nicholas Throckmorton was no friend to *Cecil*, but a creature of Lord Leicester’s, and yet here we find him deputed to press the marriage with Leicester, which the latter had told Melvil was merely a plan of *Cecil’s* (his secret enemy), to ruin him.

“May 1. A consultation to disprove the intended marriage between the Queen of Scots and Lord Darley, and an offer to marry any other nobleman in the realm.†

“May 3. Erle Murray and Argile at Edinburgh to keep the Law-day against Bothwell. The Queen hateth the Duke; the Erle of Argyle, the Erle of Murray alledging against him, that he goeth about to set the crown upon his own head.

“May 6. Lyddington in England, ambassador for the Scots Queen, to obteyn the Queen’s good-will for the Lord Darnley’s marriage, at which time he treated of the Earl of Leicester’s marriage; but he lyked it not, but moved for the Duke of Norfolk, which *he then refused*. This shews that Maitland *himself* did not wish Mary to marry Darnley, though sent to propose it—see before.

“May 21. Lord Darly made Knight, Baron, and Erle, by the Queen of Scots.

“June 4. A general consultation and advice given by the privy Counsell in the matter of Scotland.

“June 18. Erle Lenox and Lord Darnley revoked, according to the treaties.

testablement qu’ elle ne fut pas un instant abusée par les offres de la Reine d’ Angleterre. *Avant les conférences de Barwick*, elle se disposoit, à faire negocier en France et à Rome les dispenses du pape et le consentement de son beau frere, relativement à my lord Darnley;” and she enters into the comparison of dates to prove this.—Tom. ii. 284, note.

\* Duplicate. “April 24. Instructions for Sir Nicholas Throgmorton in two points. The one to procure a dissolution or stay of the marriage with the Lord Darnley. 2dly, to procure that the Queen of Scots would marry with the Earl of Leicester, or some other; and if he find it so far passed as it cannot be revoked, then he shall not use any other speech, but to declare how much it shall discontent her Majesty.”

† Duplicate. “Primo May. A determination signed by the Council, to shew their opinion against the marriage.”



“July 2. Erle Lenox and Lord Darnley \* refuse to return, Lord Darnley avowing his service to the Queen of Scotts above all others. Appeareth that the Erle of Murray refused to come home because he was threatened to be murdered.

“July 7. A Rumour spread that the Queen of Scotts should be taken by the Lords Argile and Murray. Great comfort, that the Earl of Lenox and his Sons shall not prosper, &c.

“July 10. The Queen Majesty sent a message to the Queen of Scotts of advice to regard her good subjects with more favour, and of good Counsell to the Lords.

“July 20. The Erle of Bedford arrived at Barwyk; the Scotts Queen offended with the earl of Murray.

“July 21. A proud answer of the Lord Darnley.

“July 29. Lord Darnley married to the Scotts Queen,† he being made Duke of Albany, Earl of Ross in May.

“July 30. Lord Darnley proclaimed KING.

“The Erle of Murray advised not to come to the Queen.”

The above are the very notes and memorandums of Lord Burghley himself, of the proceedings with Scotland, from June 4, 1564, to July 30, 1565.

That Lord Darnley was Mary's choice there can be no doubt, but that she was enamoured with him at first sight, and fascinated with his merely personal appearance, we much question; she had probably higher objects in view, and had Darnley proved deserving of the preference shewn him, it would seem from the foregoing memorandums alone, that when she had accomplished the marriage, she had achieved a triumph in state policy over almost all the other parties. Melvil, who pretends to have been more in the secret than was probably altogether the case, after telling us that Cecil and Leicester, my Lord of Murray and Secretary Lethington, ruled both Queens, and as yet kept good correspondence together, undertakes to inform us plainly of Cecil's intentions in this very curious business. After noticing a very remarkable fact, if it were true, namely, that when the Commissioners at Berwick had treated again of the marriage with Leicester “with slenderer offers, that is, on the part of Elizabeth, and less effectual dealing than was expected,” Leicester himself wrote “such discreet and

\* Duplicate. “The Erle of Lenox and Lord Darley refuse to return.”

† Cecil had been informed that they were married privately three weeks before, viz. on the 9th of July.—See *Keith*.

wise letters to my Lord of Murray for his excuses, that the Queen [of Scots] appeared to have so good liking to him, as the Queen of England began to suspect the said marriage might take effect," and then he adds, "her apprehension of this occasioned the Lord Darnley's getting more ready license to come to Scotland, in hope that he, being a handsome lusty youth, should rather prevail, being present, than Leicester who was absent. Which license was procured by the means of the Secretary *Cecil*, not that he was minded that any of the marriages should take effect, but with such shifts to hold the Queen unmarried so long as he could. For he persuaded himself, that my Lord Darnley durst not proceed in the marriage, without consent of the Queen of England first obtained to the said marriage; his land lying in England, and his mother remaining there: so that he thought it lay in the Queen his mistress her own hand, to let that marriage go forward, or to stay the same at her pleasure. And in case my Lord Darnley should disobey the Queen of England's command to return upon her call, he intended to cause forfait him, whereby he should lose all his lands, rights, and titles, in England."

If this were all true, and what Elizabeth told Melvil might in some sort tend to confirm it, namely, that Mary should be induced to marry, not only "within the isle," but a person upon whom Elizabeth might have some hold, that in virtue of Mary's claim to the English crown, there should be no *usurpation* of the same *before her death*; then, I say, it is obvious that Mary outwitted the whole party, and with extraordinary good management, but a bold spirit,\* baffled all the designs of *Elizabeth*, *Cecil*, *Murray*, and *Maitland*.† Instead of allowing herself to be intimidated by the intimations she received from Elizabeth, that she might offend the English party and defeat her claims, she increased her own title to the English throne, by adding to it that of Darnley (which might otherwise have been turned against her);‡ she taught *him* and *Lennox* to defy§ the authority of Elizabeth; she revived the Scotch claims of

\* Chalmers's statement agrees so much with this, that we cannot help transcribing it: "With all their sagacity they were imposed upon, by the artful blandishments of the Scottish Queen, who, under *gentleness*, and *facility*, and *playfulness*, concealed *acuteness of understanding*, sincerity of purpose, a *spirit to oppose difficulties*, and a *resolution to surmount danger*."—Vol. i. 128, 9.

† Even Randolph may be added.—See *Keith* and *Robertson*.

‡ See Darnley's title.—*Robertson*, i. 186, 7. His being a regular born English subject gave him a claim by *law*, which Mary wanted.

§ Darnley's answer to Randolph, when recalled by Elizabeth, was as follows: "Since the Queen, your mistress, is so envious of my fortune, as to oppose it by all her instruments here, I nothing

Lennox, in opposition to the House of Hamilton, to keep the latter at a distance ; she restored their possessions,\* to render them independent of England ; with a reserve to such claims as might alienate the Douglasses ; and she obtained a husband of her own race, who, besides his youth and comeliness, had royal blood enough in his veins to take the place of her illegitimate brother, Murray ; who is said to have recommended to her, to regard the Stuarts [meaning himself] in the transmission of the crown ;†—a Stuart she chose, indeed, but to his great disappointment.

But all this will appear the more plain, if it be true, as some authors have positively asserted, that the Cardinal of Lorrain was at the bottom of the whole proceedings on Mary's part. That it was *he*,‡ who first suggested the return of Lennox ; *he* who counselled or encouraged his niece to take Darnley, for fear Elizabeth should be induced to set *him* up in *opposition* to *Mary*,§ as successor to the throne of England,|| and to thwart Murray in his anxiety about the

doubt, but time may come she may have need of me ; and therefore return this answer to her, that I mind not to return : for I find myself well here."—*Strype's Annals*, ch. xlvii. When Throckmorton intimated to them some months before, Elizabeth's will that they should return, Robertson says, they both wrote submissively to the Queen ; Darnley's answer by Randolph was only nine days before his marriage : viz. July 20.

\* See *Robertson*, i. 189.

† It may be added, that while she made a mockery of Elizabeth, by alleging that she had *only followed her advice* in choosing an *Englishman* in preference to a foreigner [*Camden*],—she left Leicester just as he was, without falling into any snare which either Elizabeth or Cecil had, according to report, projected, in offering him to her choice.

‡ See *Goodall*, i. 199.—a curious authority to cite upon this occasion. *Mad<sup>re</sup>. de Keralio* depends upon him, as a sufficient authority to prove that Murray sought the crown—perhaps he might do so, in reversion ; but if he did, the Lorrainers and Mary were too subtle for him, by *Goodall's* own account.

§ See the grounds upon which the French Court *approved* the match, as soon as it had taken place. [*Robertson*, i. 192.]

|| It is scarcely to be doubted that the Cardinal, and the Catholics in general, approved all that Mary was doing, since her marriage with Darnley being within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity, required a dispensation from the Pope, which was no sooner asked for than it was granted. As soon as ever she received this instrument she was married to him with much solemnity in Holyrood Chapel, the Dean of Resthalrig performing the ceremony ; the discontented Lords, in the mean while, declaring against the marriage, but to no purpose.

They sent up a memorial, however, to Leicester and Cecil, requiring them to look narrowly to the Lady Lennox, and take care that she should be debarred from all communications with the *French* and *Spanish* ambassadors. But they had had for some time another envoy at hand, the



Stuarts, who had indeed thrown no obstacle in the way of Lennox's return, seeing it would of course embarrass his great competitors, the Hamiltons. And yet Elizabeth and Cecil have had the blame of contriving to send back Lennox for the mere purpose of creating disturbances in Mary's kingdom; whereas, Elizabeth actually forewarned Mary, when she gave Lennox permission to return, that it was likely to be attended with a revival of all the animosities between the Houses of Hamilton and Lennox; a hint with which Mary was much offended.\* And to shew how very artfully she managed matters, at the very moment when Lennox and Lady Lennox were soliciting Elizabeth's permission for Darnley to go to his father, in Scotland, and when she had even persuaded Murray and Maitland to take part in promoting the return of that family, and the restoration of their possessions; she made such a show of being inclined to conclude with Leicester, that Elizabeth became alarmed, and thus Darnley was enabled† to escape from England; to the great joy of his father and mother, who were earnestly bent upon making him a king.

Unfortunately for Mary, she could scarcely have made a worse choice, as regarded her own happiness and independence. It was very soon discovered,

famous Rizzio, of whom we shall have more to say hereafter. He was confidently believed to be a pensioner of the Pope, amply instructed to overset the Reformation; certain it is, that as he came into favour, Murray lost the confidence of the Queen, his sister, and that he was an adviser of the marriage with Darnley may be easily concluded, from their extreme intimacy on the return of the latter to Scotland, which went so far as to render them partners of the same bed. [*Rapin.*] To increase the alarm of Murray, Mary recalled some of his greatest enemies, particularly Bothwell, against whom Murray had instituted a charge of intended murder.

\* She made a very angry reply, so as for some time to occasion an interruption of all correspondence between her and Elizabeth. [*Robertson.*] Melvil was sent to reconcile matters. Elizabeth saw reason to be soon pacified, and, to end the quarrel, tore Mary's angry letter to pieces before the Ambassador, professing great love for her, which Melvil, on Mary's part, returned. "But," says Robertson, "what Melvil truly observes with respect to Elizabeth, may be extended without injustice to *both* Queens; there was neither plain dealing, nor upright meaning, but great dissimulation, envy, and fear."

† Though it is generally thought that Elizabeth sent Lord Darnley to Scotland in haste, upon being told that Mary shewed some inclination to accept of Leicester, yet the following entries in Lord Burghley's Diary, in immediate succession the one to the other, would seem to bespeak the contrary.

"1564. Nov. 7. Randolph persuadeth a great lykhood of good-will in the Queen of Scotts to my Lord Robert.

"Nov. 12. My Lord Darnlye's going *denied* by the Quene."

that, besides his extreme youth, Darnley was of a temper and disposition too uncontrollable; and of a judgment too weak to be trusted with the government of the kingdom if it could possibly be prevented. How the party most exposed to danger sought to prevent it, is another question. But though Randolph\* (another of the English *disturbers*,† as he is generally called by Mary's advocates) was manifestly on the side of the reformed party, he seems to have had no more to do than observe and report upon the course of events, disturbed enough certainly, but not through the immediate influence of Elizabeth or Cecil. Had the latter quite abandoned the reformed party, they would evidently have been playing into the hands of the adversaries of England, and raised the hopes of all the Catholics at home, just as ripe for revolt against Elizabeth, upon sufficient encouragement from France, Scotland, and *Rome* (always ready to support every opposition to the progress of the Reformation), as any of Mary's subjects could be, to resent the course she was about to take to the probable ruin of herself and country.

Mary had succeeded in obtaining Darnley, but she had matched herself with an angry and impetuous youth, likely to widen every breach, and disgust every truly wise counsellor she had about her. But she carried herself very high upon all occasions, as we may judge from the following note of Lord Burghley.

"August 10, (eleven days only after her marriage.) Mr. Tamworth sent to the Queen of Scots, and refused to be heard, but by writing he received answer,

\* See what Tytler says of Randolph in his Inquiry, vol. ii. p. 8.

† It betrays great ignorance of the political state of Europe in the sixteenth century, to insist so much as some do upon the disposition of Elizabeth and Cecil to *disturb* other countries, for the greater security of England, as though it were a practice at all peculiar to them. The following passage alone, from Daniel's History of France, may serve to shew how many other *disturbers* of the repose of Christendom there were in the world at this very period of time. Speaking of the general disposition in France and elsewhere to suppress the Hugonots (under the year 1564), he says, "The King of Spain was apprehensive lest the Hugonots of France, if let alone, should support those of the Low Countries, who began to revolt in several places. Besides he thought it of considerable advantage to his states, that France should not *enjoy too great a tranquillity*. The Emperor, who had lately renewed his instances for the restitution of *Metz, Toul, and Verdun*, looked upon a civil war in France as a means to arrive at this end; while the Duke of Savoy was in hopes, by the *same* methods, to recover with more ease the towns which the French still kept possession of in Piedmont," &c. Rapin, considering the state of things on Mary's marriage, and the cabals against England consequent thereto, adds, "It will not appear strange that Elizabeth fomented the troubles in Scotland, to put it out of the power of her enemies to invade her."

which were offers to live in peace with the Queen of England, so as she might be declared heir to the Queen's Majesty, and the Lady Lennox next to her. Which offers Tamworth refused to accept, and afterward Tamworth was stayed at Dunbar, and carried to Hume Castle."\*

Tamworth was a gentleman of the privy-chamber, and he carried with him, it is said, a letter from Elizabeth in her own hand, demanding that Darnley, to whom *she gave the title of King*,† should be delivered up to her, according to the tenor of the treaty on foot between them. Mary had reason perhaps to resent such a demand; but her own demand was, as she must have known, quite as repugnant to the feelings of Elizabeth, especially in taking the opportunity at such a moment of introducing the claim of the Lady Lennox. But we are farther told, that when Mary refused to give Tamworth an audience, she consented to receive the letter, and whilst she was reading it in the presence of some Lords, Rizzio came in, and snatching it out of her hands, hindered her proceeding. He judged that Elizabeth demanded the King, only to oblige the Queen to pardon the exiles, to which he could not agree, being determined to ruin them, though Murray had sent him a submissive letter with a fine diamond inclosed. Mary answered Elizabeth that she would not attempt any thing against England so long as she lived, provided she was declared her presumptive heir by act of Parliament. As to the fugitive Lords, she desired Elizabeth to leave her at liberty to dispose of them as she pleased, since she did not meddle with what passed in England.—*History of the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. In the meantime letters appear to have been intercepted from

\* Mr. Lodge says, in a note to a letter implying the contrary from Lord Bedford, vol. i. p. 353, that he has not found any account of Tamworth's detention in Scotland, in any history. The above is copied from Lord Burghley's Diary—but it would seem that he *brought back* the message above. See p. 759, *Diary*.

† "To whom she vouchsafed to give the title of King."—*Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth after Rapin*. Yet Camden, speaking of Tamworth's rude behaviour towards Mary, gives it as an instance, that "he vouchsafed not her husband the title of King." This difference between Elizabeth and her Minister, if both accounts be true, it would seem difficult to reconcile; but, as Camden says, "he received entertainment below his worth, as he thought," perhaps it proceeded from private pique and resentment. But it may be doubted, whether Elizabeth ever gave Darnley the title of King. Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio insists upon it, that Elizabeth's directions to her Minister not to give Darnley the title of King, was the cause of the neglect shewn him at the *Prince's* christening, of which we shall have to speak, but we doubt the instructions; and at all events he received worse treatment from the French than from the English Minister.



Sir Francis Englefield, from Lorrain, “wherein he commendeth his *duty* to the Scotts Queen.” As a natural born subject of England, his *duty* was owing elsewhere; but it was well known to be alienated, by his Popish connexions and attachments.

“September 5. (Lord Burghley’s notes proceed :) The Lords of Scotland, viz. the Duke, Earl of Murray, &c. came to Dumfrees.

“September 24, a consultation at Windsor, whether the Lords of Scotland, being expelled by the Scotts Queen, should be aided.

“October 10, I was sent to Nonsuch to confer with the Earl of Arundell concerning the proceeding against the Queen of Scotts.”

Here end all the notes respecting Scotland to the termination of the year 1565, according to the present or historical reckoning; being less than two months beyond the seventh year of the Queen’s reign.

It is now time to bring the other transactions, in which Lord Burghley bore quite as great a share, to the same period.—We shall begin with those relating to the Continent.

Newhaven, or Havre-de-Grace, was surrendered, as we have shewn,\* on the 28th of July, 1563. On the 2d August (to follow Lord Burghley’s notes) the plague began in London, brought thither by the troops returned from Normandy. On the 27th of October, a commission was sent over to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton and Sir Thomas Smith, to treat for peace; and on the 11th of April, 1564, a treaty was concluded at *Troyes* in Champagne; on the 23d the French hostages were set at liberty; and on the 29th the peace ratified by the Queen, and delivered to the French Ambassador by Sir William *Cecil* and Dr. Wotton. It was confirmed on the first of May by the French King, and on the 28th, Lord Hunsdon, the Queen’s cousin,† was sent to France, to invest Charles IX. with the Order of the Garter; which ceremony took place on the 24th of June; on the 25th the Emperor Ferdinand died. The disputes between the Catholics and Protestants in France, during the years 1564, 1565, were rather smothered for a time than extinguished, while in the Netherlands the Duchess of Parma, who had been appointed Governess by Philip, with the Cardinal Granvelle for

\* Leicester endeavoured to throw all the blame of this unsuccessful expedition on *Cecil*, but was well and coolly answered by the Queen, in the following terms: “The Secretary has done his duty, but neither he nor I can command events.”

† “*Cujus fuerat matertera pulchra,  
Reginæ genetrix Henrici nobilis Uxor.*”

her Minister, in her resentment of the spread of Protestantism, in the Low Countries, imprudently allowed her prejudices to operate to the disturbance of the commerce between the States and England: fortunately in the room of that great disturber, the Bishop of Aquila, Philip had lately sent as his Minister to the Court of Elizabeth, Don Diego de *Gusman*, a prudent and wise man, who seeing how hurtful these differences might prove in the end, to the Netherlands, carefully sought to compound matters, though things do not appear to have been brought to a good conclusion, according to Lord Burghley's notes, before the 18th of December, 1564; when we read, that "an accord was made between the Queen Majesty and the Duchess of Parma for continuing of the *intercourse*\* or 'Great Intercourse,' as it was called, made in the time of Maximilian, with other articles delivered;" and on the 29th of the same month, a Proclamation was issued to give effect to the same. In the month of May, 1565, "a motion was made in France for a marriage between Charles IX. the French King, and the Queen's Majesty;" and in the month of June following, an Ambassador arrived from the new Emperor, Maximilian, "to move a marriage with the Archduke Charles his brother."—[Lord Burghley's notes.]§

We shall now turn to the state of things at home. In Lord Burghley's notes are some memorandums relating to his family concerns which should of course not be passed over; we have noticed the birth of his daughter *Elizabeth* (afterwards Countess of Derby), which happened on the 1st of July, 1564; on Easter day of that year, viz. April 2, the following note occurs.

"H. Killegrew wrote to me an invective for my misliking† of his marriage

\* Cardinal Granvelle's policy had been to get the English out of the country, before a war should be kindled in the Netherlands, which he had every reason to foresee and expect; on the prohibition to import English cloths, the English set up a Staple at Embden, in East Friesland. The wise advice of Gusman brought them back. Camden tells us, that in his time the commerce between England and the Netherlands, rose yearly to above twelve millions of gold, and that the woollen trade alone, amounted to above five millions.

† On the death of Ferdinand, the Secretary had nearly been sent on an embassy to the new Emperor, but got himself excused, on the score of ill health and pressure of public business at home.—*Strype's Annals*, i. ch. xl. 1564.

Obsequies were solemnized for the Emperor at London, September 23, 1564, Sir William being one of the principal mourners.—*Ib.*

‡ It is probable, that in many points, Cecil and Killegrew must have been so much of the same disposition and character as to have been excellent friends. Lloyd's account of Killegrew's studies is singular enough. "From Tully (whose orations he could repeat to his dying day)

with my sister, Catharyn Cook." What objections Sir William had to this marriage, does not appear; but it is probable, they were soon over-ruled, since the marriage took place, and Mr. Killegrew (afterwards Sir Henry), being a man of good abilities, is known to have served the Queen with much credit in several embassies; and to have lived in great esteem till the beginning of the following century, 1602.§

he gained an even and apt style, flowing at one and the self-same height. Tully's Offices, a book which boys read, and men understand, was so esteemed of my Lord *Burghley*, that to his dying day, he always carried it about him, either in his bosom, or his pocket, as a compleat piece, that, like Aristotle's Rhetorick, would make both a scholar and an honest man."—He then enumerates in his odd way, the authors *Killegrew* delighted in, as *Cicero*, *Cæsar*, *Livy*, *Tacitus*, *Curtius*, *Sallust*, *Xenophon*, *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, *Polybius*, and "sweet *Plutarch*, whose books (said *Gaza*) would furnish the world, were all others lost;" and adds, after *Diodorus Siculus*, "here he sat on the stage of human life, observing the great circumstances of places, persons, times, manners, occasions, &c., and was made wise by their example who have trod the path of error and danger before him."

\* Lady Killegrew appears to have been in no degree inferior to her sisters, in point either of natural abilities or acquired talents. We have two pieces of poetry of hers inserted in the *Biographia Britannica*, which deserve a place here. One, indeed, is her own epitaph in Latin; many others are said to have been composed for her, one in Greek and Latin, by her sister Lady *Russel*, and three Latin ones, by *Robert Forman*, of the Reformed French Church, *Andrew Melvin*, and *William Chark*; her own is as follows;

Dormio nunc Domino, Domini virtute resurgam.

Et Σωτήρα meum carne videbo meâ.

Mortua ne dicar, fruitur pars altera Christo;

Et surgam capiti, tempore, tota meo.

The other is elegantly sentimental, and happens to be addressed to her sister, Lady *Cecil*, to procure her interest to stay the embassy beyond sea, some say of a lover, but most likely of her husband, Sir Henry, and cause him to be sent back to her in Cornwall.

Si mihi quem cupio curas MILDREDA remitti,

Tu bona, tu melior, tu mihi sola soror:

Sin male cessando retines, et trans mare mittis,

Tu mala, tu pejor, tu mihi nulla soror.

Is si cornubiam, tibi pax sit et omnia læta;

Sin mare, CÍCILIÆ nuncio bella—vale!

They have been well translated,

If, Mildred, to my wishes kind,

Thy valued charge thou send,

In thee my soul shall own combined

The sister and the friend,



On the 21st of August, 1564, we have the following entry, in Lord Burghley's diary : " At Bever to see my Lord Latymer's daughter for my son ;" and on the 27th of November, in the same year, " My son Thomas Cecill (afterwards first Earl of Exeter) married at Moncton in Yorkshire." The Lady whom Mr. Cecil married was one of the coheirs of Nevil, Lord Latimer ; he had a large family by her, as many as five sons and eight daughters, of whom we shall have more to say hereafter. William, his eldest son, named, probably, after his grandfather, and who succeeded him in his titles and estates, was born in 1566.\*

In the autumn of the year 1565, the Secretary lost one of his earliest and most particular friends ; thus noticed by himself as an occurrence of that year. " Oct. 14.—Sir Thomas Challoner died, and was buried in Paul's church, where Sir William *Cecil* was chief mourner." Sir Thomas was a gallant soldier, and, like Sir William himself, an able statesman, he was also a poet ; in point of years he was senior to Sir William, having been born in 1515, he was bred at the same University of Cambridge, and sent abroad, according to the custom of those days, by Henry VIII. and chiefly at his expense : becoming known to Charles V., and an admirer of his achievements, he was induced to accompany that monarch upon his famous expedition to Algiers, in the year 1541, and had nearly been lost in a tempest at sea ; being only saved by catching hold of a cable, that providentially came in his way, with his teeth, when nearly exhausted by swimming in the dark, and thereby with great peril drawn up into the ship. He was with the Duke of Somerset at the battle of Musselburgh, 1547,† and for his great bravery knighted ; he was one of those who continued in England under Mary, but without any disavowal of his principles, being a firm and zealous Protestant ; he interested himself greatly in the case of Sir John Cheke, and would probably have fallen into trouble, had he

If, from my eyes by thee detained,  
 The Wanderer cross the seas,  
 No more thy love shall soothe, as friend,  
 No more as sister, please.  
 His stay, let Cornwall's shore engage,  
 And peace with Mildred dwell :  
 Else war with Cecil's name I wage,  
 Perpetual war——Farewell.

\* Lodge, iii. 9.—where may be seen a letter from Mr. Cecil to Lord Talbot, 1590.

† See Vol. i.

not been protected, as was in all likelihood the case with his friend Sir William, by those to whom he had shewn civilities, or succoured under Edward. On the accession of Elizabeth, and probably through the influence of the Secretary, he had the honour of being the first ambassador appointed by her Majesty, and that to the Court of Ferdinand I. Emperor of Germany; he was very honourably entertained by the Emperor, and had a great hand in endeavouring to procure a match between Elizabeth and the Archduke Charles, even with the consent, approbation, and assistance of *Philip of Spain*; to whose Court being unfortunately sent upon a second mission on his return from Germany, he received some slights and indignities there which his high spirit could ill brook; he was careful, however, never to compromise under any affronts the honour of his Sovereign, but his time was passed uncomfortably enough; "in winter in a stove, and in summer in a barn," as he described it,\* and in the end his health suffered. He obtained his recal by an elegy to Elizabeth, after the manner of *Ovid*, and towards the end of 1564, published the first five books of his "Right Ordering of the English Republic;" a work which he had written to occupy and amuse the dull hours of his Spanish ministry, and which he dedicated to his old and good friend Sir William Cecil. It is doubted whether this work was ever carried further.

Sir Thomas is celebrated for many virtues, but for none more than the warmth and tried sincerity of his friendship; which shone forth not more in the case of the *Protector* Somerset, whose cause he never abandoned,† than of some of much lower rank, but equally bad fortune, to whom he remained firmly attached to the last. It was therefore very properly said of him, "a true friend was the best picture of this gentleman's mind," since his love knew no bounds, could not be diverted by any danger, or divorced even by death itself; in fact, he wrote many elegies and other poems in praise of his deceased as well as of his living friends. His long poem on the unhappy Lady Jane Grey, is too well known to be insisted upon at present; he translated the *Moriæ encomium* of *Erasmus*, having been a disciple and friend of the *author*; he wrote a poem in praise of his first patron Henry VIII., which he addressed to Queen Elizabeth. Two other patrons, Sir Thomas Parry and Lord Paget came in for their share of

\* "Hieme in furno, ætate in horreo."

† As this attachment to the Protector kept him from accepting any place under Northumberland, we may justly infer that had Cecil at all disgraced himself with the Protector, as some have insinuated, Chaloner's friendship for him would have abated.

such posthumous praises, nor was his good friend Sir John Cheke forgotten. We shall conclude our notice of Sir Thomas Chaloner by observing that his best work *de Repub. Anglorum instauranda* is said to have been written on the express encouragement of Sir William Cecil, and that the latter, notwithstanding his many public avocations, did honour to the memory of his friend, by a long copy of Latin verses, since published with his works; but still more by his great attention to his son, whose education after Sir Thomas's death, and the marriage of his widow with a second husband, he took wholly upon himself; nor was his care and benevolence ill-bestowed, or ill-requited. For his young friend applied himself so diligently to study, as to become accomplished in many branches of learning, particularly natural history, which he learned and cultivated with such good success during his travels in Italy, as to enable him on his return to make a discovery from which his country may be said to have derived most important advantages ever since; we allude to the alum mines near Gisborough, in the county of York, which were the first ever known in this kingdom, and which we owe entirely, as it appears, to the sagacity and very curious observations and experiments of the *second* Sir Thomas Chaloner (for the son, it may be observed, obtained as well as his father the honour of knighthood): in a journey afterwards to Scotland, he so ingratiated himself with King James and his Queen, as to be particularly chosen to accompany them to England on the death of Elizabeth, and to take upon him the whole charge of their son Prince Henry, "That delight and glory of Britain," as Camden calls him.

Among Lord Burghley's memorandums, for the year 1564; we find the following—

"August 5. The Queen at Cambridge."

This is certainly a very short account of one of the most curious visits this great Queen paid, and a very modest one, considering the part Lord Burghley had to perform in it, as Chancellor of that very University, and yet there is not a word more about it, which may excuse the extreme brevity with which events of great importance are known to have been noted down by him, sometimes with an almost apparent want of feeling; as, "16 Oct. *Ridley*, B. of London, *Latymer*, burnt: 21 March, *Cranmer*, A. B. of Cant., burnt—eodem die *Card. Poole* sang his first mass." Considering his almost intimate acquaintance with these eminent persons, and martyrs to the great cause in which he was so much interested, as we have shewn in our first volume, it is well to have a specimen of his conciseness, on an occasion wherein he had so much temptation to enlarge,



as the Queen's visit to Cambridge, when, next to her Majesty's self, he was actually, by office, the greatest personage.\*

The brief account of this visit, is as follows: "The daies of her abode, were passed in scholasticall exercises of philosophie, physicke, and divinity; the nights, in comedies and tragedies, set forth partly by the whole University, and partly by the students of the King's College. At the breaking up of the Divinity act, being on Wednesday, the 9th of August, (on the which day, she rode thro' the towne, and viewed the colleges, those goodly and auncient monuments of the kings of England, her noble predecessors,) she made within St. Marie's Church, a notable oration in Latine, in the presence of the whole University, to the students great comfort."

It may easily be supposed, that the Chancellor had much fatigue to undergo, upon this great and solemn occasion; and the account of the whole, as contained in the "*Triumphs of the Muses*," communicated to Mr. Peck, from a MS. in the hands of Roger Gale, Esq., and collated with the Harl. MSS. 7037, 109, entitled, *Queen Elizabeth's coming to Cambridge, 1564*, begins with Sir William's letter to the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Hawford, Master of Christ's College; acquainting him with the Queen's intended design to come thither, and wishing him to provide lodgings, and such academical exercises, for her entertainment, as might be most agreeable for her; dated from Greenwich, 12 Julii, 1564. We need not transcribe the whole letter, as it is extant in many other works; but after speaking of the preparation for the Queen's lodgings, he adds, "as for myself, I meane to lodge with my old nurse, in St. John's College; and so I praye you inform the Master." Upon the receipt of this letter, the two Proctors were dispatched to London, to confer with Sir William, where they received from his hands all such orders as were necessary; but that every thing might be the better seen to, he accepted the offer of Dr. Goodman, Dean of Westminster, to go thither to superintend the preparations, by whom he sent a letter, ending, "I mean to be at Sir Ralfe Sadler's, on Thursday next, at night; and on Friday night, at Cambridge, or near to Haselingeilde, if I may find any lodging. 1 Aug. 1564. W. Cecyll."

\* The next entry to that of the Queen's being at Cambridge, is as follows: "Aug. 18. Her Majesty at xx in Leicestershire:" which we merely notice, because Mr. Nichols, in his great work of the *Progresses*, says, under the year 1565, "it is not very clear whether she was in Leicestershire in this or the preceding year."—*Preface*, xv. It is evident from Lord Burghley's Notes, that she was there in 1564, though it is a pity he was not more particular, as a guide to such researches as Mr. N. was unable to complete.

“ Upon Friday, the 4th of August, Sir William arrived at Cambridge, with his lady, in a coach, about 3 o'clock, in the afternoon, and took up his lodging at the Master's chambers of St. John's College, where he was received with an oration. When he had reposed himself awhile, he sent for the Vice-Chancellor, and all the Heads of Colleges; for he would in no case, that either they should meet him by the way (as it was thought good by some to do), or to come ere he was ready, for he was troubled with lameness; he communicated to them all his wishes, particularly, that ‘ uniformity should be shewed in apparel and religion,’ and so for a time dismissed the company; willing and commanding the Bedells (a curious instance of his politeness), to wait upon the Vice-Chancellor homeward, who would otherwise have remained with Sir William, being High Chancellor. He was abundantly thanked by the University, for his courteous and polite attentions, and requested to place himself at their head, at the receiving of the Queen, to deliver up the Bedells' staves: which he promised; whereupon he was presented with two pair of gloves, a march-pain,\* and two sugar loaves; and then they took their leave.”

On the 5th of August, the Lord Robert Dudley arrived as Lord High Steward of the University; he was met at King's College, which was the place of the Court, by the Chancellor and Heads of Colleges, preceded by all the Bedells bare-headed, where after he had properly saluted Sir William *Cecil*, he was brought to his lodgings at the Master's, the doors and walls being hung with complimentary verses, and the same gifts presented to him as had been given to the Chancellor; he then accompanied the Chancellor to his lodgings in St. John's College, where all the Members were severally presented to him.

It is quite unnecessary to enter into the details of this remarkable solemnity, since such full accounts are to be found of it, in works well known to the public. It was on the 5th of August her Majesty arrived, and while she was receiving all due honours and submission from the Mayor and Corporation, “ Sir William *Cecyl*,” we read, “ sate upon his horse at the gate beyond the Queen's College, and caused certain of the guard to keep the street with strict commandment as was given before; and turned all the train into the town, except the Lords and Officers in attendance upon her Grace. Then came the Trumpeters, and, by solemn blast, declared her Majesty to approach; then followed the Lords in their order and degree; her Almoner, the Bishop of Rochester

\* Or March-pane, a sweet biscuit, composed of sugar and almonds, like those now called Macaroons.—See *Nares's Glossary*, where there is a long and curious article upon it.

[*Guest*] bare-headed, with the Bishop of Ely ; then Garter King at Arms, in his royal coat ; with divers Sergeants at Arms ; then the Lord Hunsdon with the sword in a royal scabbard of goldsmith's work ; and after him, the QUEENS MAJESTIE, with a great company of Ladies and Maids of Honor ; who, at the entrance of Queen's College was informed by Mr. *Secretary*, of the Scholars, of what sort they were, and the like he did of all other companies and degrees."

The Queen's dress upon this occasion, is described to have been a gown of black velvet, pinked ; a caul upon her head set with pearls and precious stones ; a hat that was spangled with gold ; and a bush of feathers.

The Ladies in attendance forsook their horses when her Majesty arrived among the Doctors, and the Queen alone remained on horseback.

At King's College south gate, the *Mayor* riding before her Majesty bare-headed, stayed himself ; as being arrived, according to the instructions he had received the day before from the Chancellor, at the limits of his jurisdiction and authority.

"When the Queen 'had arrived at the west door of the chapel, then Sir William CECYL kneeled down and welcomed her Grace, shewing unto her the order of the Doctors ; and the Bedells kneeling kissed their staves, and delivered them to the Chancellor, who likewise kissed the same, and so delivered them to the Queen's hands, who could not well hold them all ; and her Grace gently and merrily re-delivered them, willing him and other Magistrates of the University to minister justice uprightly, as she trusted they did ; or she would take them into her own hands and see to it ; adding, although the Chancellor did halt (for he was lame, as has been said before), yet she trusted that justice did not halt."

For the orations spoken, comedies and tragedies acted, services performed, we must refer to other books (particularly the *Progresses* by Mr. Nichols), but must notice that by the hands of Sir William and the Lord Robert, her Majesty was presented in the name of the University, with four pair of Cambridge double gloves, edged and trimmed with two laces of fine gold ; and six boxes of fine comfits and other conceits, "which having took thankfully, she went to her chamber."

"Then the Bedells, receiving the Chancellor at the same place, went before him with their staves to his lodging, he riding upon a little black nag."

On the 6th of August the Queen was entertained at King's College ; but it is impossible for us to attempt here to give an account of all that passed ; it is



sufficient to say, that every thing was regulated according to the strictest orders of the Chancellor.

On the 7th her Majesty was at St. Mary's Church, where many public exercises were performed, and in all the faculties ; the Chancellor sitting next to the Queen's feet, with a cloth and long velvet cushion before him. It is remarkable, that upon this and other occasions, the two Proctors of the University of Oxford were present in their full academical dresses, sent for, as one of them stated to the reporter of the proceedings there,\* by a special invitation from the Chancellor *Cecil*, that they might be upon the spot to observe what passed at Cambridge, in case the Queen should be disposed also to visit the sister University. Through the Chancellor's influence, they received peculiar attentions from the whole body, were seated next to the Cambridge Proctors at all the ceremonies, having two of the *Oxford* Bedells in attendance upon them, and were daily entertained at some College or Hall. There was certainly a propriety in this, which bespoke a considerable refinement of manners for those times. Leicester was indeed Chancellor of Oxford, but we have authority for asserting, that the invitation originated entirely with the Secretary, thereby rendering the compliment to the sister University, and her Chancellor, the more generous and delicate.

When all things were ready for the commencement of any public exercise, and the Chancellor had explained to the Queen the order of their proceedings, he caused the Proctors to be brought before her Majesty, in order to receive from her own mouth authority to moderate and rule the disputations, which, upon their kneeling down to take her commands, she conveyed to them in these words : " *Omnia fiant ordine.*" Every body continued standing, until the Queen, by the Chancellor, had granted them permission to be seated. Whenever the voices of the disputants became inaudible to the Queen, she would herself call out, " *Loquimini altius.*" On the evening of this day, the 7th, her Majesty heard the tragedy of *Dido*, in hexameter verse, performed by the students of King's College only, the Chancellor *Cecil*, and Lord Robert, High Steward, " vouchsafing to hold the books" (for the purpose probably of prompting the performers, and to ensure the greater order).

On the 9th of August, the last day her Majesty passed in the University, she seems to have visited many Colleges, " riding in state royal ; the Chancellor and

\* Dr. *Robinson*, as some suppose, Chaplain to Archbishop Parker ; others think it might be Mr. *Stokys*.

all the Lords and Gentlemen riding before her, and her Ladies behind." At King's College she received from the Provost a book covered with red velvet, containing all the verses made upon her Grace's coming. But the Chancellor had, before her coming, given particular directions for preparing two books for her; in one of which was to be written, in the Roman hand, all the verses, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Chaldee, and English, that should be made or set up in different parts of the University; in the other, the names of all founders and benefactors of distinct Colleges, present members of those societies, and of eminent persons educated there in times past. These books were prepared accordingly, and carried round by the Chancellor to the several Colleges as he attended her Majesty, to whom he read what appertained thereto, in their proper places. As her Grace rid through the streets, she talked very much with divers scholars in Latin; and, at her lighting off her horse, with Latin dismissed them.\* At St. Mary's Church in the afternoon of the same day, she took her leave of the University, in a *Latin* speech, easily to be seen in other books. She proposed to address them in English; but being told by the Chancellor that nothing might be said openly to the University in English, she required him the rather to speak, because he was Chancellor, and the Chancellor is the Queen's mouth. Whereunto he answered, that he was Chancellor of the University, and not hers. At length, being moved on every side, she addressed them in a Latin speech,† which may be read in Fuller, Nichols, &c. and in the latter with Mr. Peck's translation.‡ The speech of course savoured largely of the taste of the times; and at her conclusion, when her auditors saluted her with loud acclamations of "Vivat Regina," she said, "Taceat Regina," wishing they were all in the way, in regard to her oration, to drink of the waters of *Lethe*.§

\* Strange as this may appear at present, it is probable, that among the Ladies in attendance on her Majesty, there were some who could have done the same—particularly the Chancellor's own Lady, Mildred Lady Cecil, who, as we have observed in our first volume, was known to be a great proficient both in Latin and Greek.

† "Prepared probably by Cecil himself."—*Aikin's Court of Elizabeth*.

‡ In Nichols' Progresses are references of course to the other books that treat of the particulars of this visit.

§ Of the Queen's extraordinary learning there can be no doubt. The famous Roger Ascham was at this time her Secretary, who being often with her at Windsor, had opportunities of knowing what, with a sly inuendo against the less diligent Prebendaries or Canons of that Collegiate Church, he has stated in his celebrated work, the Schoolmaster. "Beside her readiness in Latin, Italian, French, and Spanish," says he, "I believe she read there at Windsor (1563, &c.) more Greek every day, than some Prebendaries of that Church did read Latin in a whole week;" and to

On the 10th of August the Queen left Cambridge, with many ceremonies, as may be concluded. She dined on that day at the Bishop of Ely's at Stanton, and slept at Hinchinbrook, the seat of Sir Henry Cromwell.

In 1565 the Queen paid her first visit to Kenilworth, passing through Coventry in her way to it, where the Mayor, presenting her with a purse containing £100, she observed, "that it was a goodly gift, £100 in gold! I have few such gifts!" The Mayor replied, "If it please your Grace there is a great deal more in it." "What is that?" said the Queen. "It is, Madam," said the Mayor, "the hearts of all your loving subjects." "I thank you, Mr. Mayor," said her Majesty, "it is a great deal more indeed."

Queen Elizabeth labours to this day under such a stigma in the estimation of all persons of sentiment and feeling, in consequence of her long incarceration and final execution of Mary Queen of Scots, that it is well, in common justice, to record such instances of her popularity amongst her own subjects. Courtly

shew how little superficial her reading of Greek was, in the estimation of that eminent scholar, he affirms, "that when she read with him Demosthenes or Æschines, she made him often wonder, when he saw how critically she understood, not only the force of the words, the structure of the sentences, the propriety of the language, the ornament of the speech, and the handsome contexture of the whole discourse, but those things also which are greater, *viz.* the sense and mind of the orator, and the stress and drift of the whole cause, the law and desire of the people, the manner and institution of every city, and all other things of that nature."

I have before my eyes another extraordinary contemporary testimony, that of the learned Cooper, compiler of the "*Thesaurus Linguae Romanæ et Britannicæ*." The edition of this work, in my possession, was published in the year 1565, and is dedicated to the Earl of Leicester, having his famous cognizance of the bear and ragged staff in the title-page. I must be excused transcribing one passage, as it alludes to the Queen's visit to Cambridge; her speech there does credit to her Majesty, and the Chancellors of *both* Universities, *Cecil* and *Leicester*.

"Sed imprudenter à me et intempestivè hæc illata videtur querela, cum omnium jam sermone pervulgatum sit, tuo maxime consilio, et clarissimi viri SICILLI Majestatem regiam jamdudum iniisse rationem, quemadmodum non artes solum injuria temporis labantes, in pristinam restituantur dignitatem, sed etiam ut Juventus ignavia languescens gloriæ stimulis erectæ magis constanter perferat graves studiorum labores, hanc opinionem mentibus hominum infixit anno superiore *Cantabrigiensis* profectio: Cum Regia Majestas in ipsis quasi Musarum delubris, non solum præsentia sua declaravit honestissimarum artium cultores sibi et curæ fuisse, et delectationi, sed etiam splendida et illustri oratione studiosorum animos ad singularem quandam spem amplissimorum virtutis et industriæ præmiorum concitabat:"—but the whole epistle should be read. Cooper was advanced first to the Deanery of Gloucester, 1569, then to the see of Lincoln, and lastly, to that of Winchester, 1584. He died Bishop of that see, April 29, 1594.—See what is said of this learned prelate, and other lexicographers of those times, in *Drake's Shakespeare*, &c. vol. i. ch. ii,



compliments are, in general, not much to be depended upon; but there are facts upon record, regarding the popularity of certain of our English and British Sovereigns, not to be doubted. Elizabeth was always popular, and never appeared in public but to her advantage. How much she deserved to be so at this time, may be judged from an excellent letter to her from the celebrated John Fox, on her speech at Cambridge and visit to that University, to be seen in Strype's *Annals*, in Latin and English, ch. xxxix.

It is difficult to account for the following entry in Lord Burghley's Notes in the year 1565.

"August . . . . The Queens Majestie seemed to be much offended with the Erle of Leicester; and so she wrote an obscure sentence in a book at Windsor." This is supposed to have been after the visit to Kenilworth. ["The cause," says Strype, "seemed to be for not liking the Queen's marrying with the Archduke."]

An unpleasant circumstance occurred in the course of the year 1564, which, though we could not mention in its proper place,\* it would be improper to pass unnoticed, as it related to the succession, which gave the Secretary no small trouble at all times; but, in this particular instance, implicated his great friend and relative, the Lord Keeper,† and, in some degree, himself; we allude to the case of Hales, who, being a zealous Protestant, imprudently put forth a book calculated to set aside the Scotch claims (which Elizabeth, in her heart, is supposed to have favoured), by shewing that the descendants of the Duchess of Suffolk were next to the Queen; as was certainly the case by Henry's will. This imprudent book, fortified by the opinions of lawyers beyond sea, whom Hales had been forward to consult, had a sad effect with regard to the surviving represen-

\* The necessity we lay under of relating what passed regarding the marriage of Lord Darnley and the Queen of Scots, during the years 1564, 1565, has been the occasion of our omitting several circumstances in their regular order, particularly some that did not require to be more than noticed in the present work; such as the death of the great Reformer Calvin, which took place at Geneva on the 27th of May, 1564, in the fifty-fifth or fifty-sixth year of his age. It was in the same year also, that the celebrated Creed of Pope Pius IV., as settled by the Council of Trent, and still regarded as the acknowledged summary of the Roman Catholic faith, was first published in the form of a Bull, addressed to all the faithful in Christ.—See *Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, 1825.

† The Lord Keeper was obliged to absent himself from the Court; but the Secretary never rested till he got him restored to the Queen's favour. Camden says he was accused by *Leicester* of being privy to Hales' book, and of encouraging the *Suffolk* claims against Mary of Scots, "whom," says he, "Dudley was wooing with all the offices he could."

tative of that family, the unfortunate Lady Catherine Grey, sister to Lady Jane.\* After having been divorced from the son of Lord Pembroke, her first husband (to whom she was married on the same day that her sister married the Lord Guilford Dudley, see vol. i., and divorced by the policy of her husband's father, on Mary's accession, see Nicolas's *Life of Lady Jane Grey*, cxviii.), she had been, as it was alleged, privately married to the Earl of Hertford, by whom she had a son: that son, according to Hales, if legitimate, would come into the immediate line of inheritance, totally superseding all the Scottish claims. As the Queen had not been consulted about the marriage, an attention then held to be due to the crown in all cases of such near relationship, it had become a matter of suspicion, and both Lord Hertford and his Lady were committed to the Tower. *Cecil* was so hurt by all these proceedings, as to express himself in a letter to Sir Thomas Smith† in the following terms; "I pray that God may by this chance give her Majesty a disposition to consider hereof [*i. e.* of the succession]; that either by her marriage, or by some common order, we her poor subjects might know where to lean and adventure our lives, with contentation of our consciences." Unfortunately for the Secretary, the case was particularly referred to him, and, however, irksome the task,‡ he assured his friend

\* Not to the *consort* of Lady Jane: an odd mistake, to be corrected in the Preface to Nichols's *Progresses*, xxvi.

† Camden observes that Cecil kept his own judgment upon this point fast locked up in his own breast, and so resolved always to do, unless the Queen herself should command him to deliver it, who certainly never heard any thing more unwillingly, than that the title of succession should be called in question.

‡ Mr. Hallam, in his *Constitutional History of England*, speaking of Sir William, says, "Even *Cecil*, though he had taken a share in prosecuting Lady Catherine;" "*taken a share*," seems not exactly the expression that should have been used, according to the letter referred to, especially as it is followed by an insinuation that he might secretly have favoured the Suffolk claims—in fact, he probably could not decline the reference, and as to his opinions, as long as Mary of Scotland had a Protestant heir, they may be held to have depended much on future contingencies. As Mr. Hallam himself judiciously observes, he might not like to *discountenance* a party from which the Queen and religion had nothing to dread. Anthony Wood, pretends to affirm that Cecil had as much hand in the writing and publication of Hales's book as the Chancellor, but this does not appear. See, however, what is said of it in the Article assigned to Sir Nicholas Bacon in the *Biographia Britannica*. But it should still be noticed, that among the *corrigenda* of the first volume of the latter work (enlarged edition), a publication is referred to, which is judged to afford a complete proof that Sir N. Bacon was a strenuous assertor of the title of the *Queen of Scots*, against Sir Anthony Brown.

Sir Thomas, that he would proceed uprightly, neither inclining *ad dextram* or *ad sinistram*. The marriage which Hales attempted to prove and defend, after the Archbishop had given sentence against it in default of witnesses, was as some thought no more than a contract to marry by mutual consent;\* besides the Lord Hertford and the Lady Catherine, her uncle Lord John Grey, was, for the part he had taken in the business, put into custody of the Court. When the plague raged in London, in consequence of the return of the troops from France, Lord Hertford and the Lady Catherine were both removed from the Tower; the former being placed with his mother, the Duchess of Somerset, the latter with her uncle, Lord John, at Pyrgo in Essex, where in the end, she died,† *it is said*, of grief. (1567.) Her uncle, also, is reputed to have died of “thought,” meaning, probably, sorrow; but as he was of a gouty habit, his death may be otherwise

\* In Bishop Jewel’s letter to Peter Martyr, already cited, he thus describes the case: “Est puella quædam nobilis, Domina Catherina, Ducis Suffolchiensis Filia, ex sanguine regio, eoque nominatim scripta ab Henrico Octavo in Testamento, ut si quid accidisset, *quarto loco* succederet. Ex ea, Comes Hertfordiensis, Juvenis, Ducis Somersetensis Filius, suscepit Filium, et multi putant ex stupro, sed ut *ipsis* dicunt, ex legitimis nuptiis. Se enim clam inter se contraxisse, et advocato sacrificatore, et paucis quibusdam arbitris, junxisse nuptias. Ea res, turbavit animos multorum; nam si sunt veræ nuptiæ, Puer, qui susceptus est, alitur ad spem Regni.” And then follows the reflection on the uncertainty of the succession before mentioned, “O nos miseros,” &c.—Burnet, iii. Records, No. 65. Jewel’s expression, “et multi putant ex stupro,” seems to contradict what is said by the author of the Court of Elizabeth, that “No one doubted that they were lawfully married.” Strype, in his Life of Archbishop Parker, says, “At most, it seems to have been but a contract, consummated without the ceremony of a solemnization.” Others, however, allege that time was not allowed for bringing forward the witnesses. The marriage at all events could not be proved at the time. Cecil, himself, in communicating the fact of her first pregnancy to the Archbishop, only observes, “She says she is married.” This letter bears date, August 12, 1561. The Archbishop’s sentence was not passed before the middle of May, 1562.

In January, 1562, Sir John Mason wrote to Cecil, recommending harsher measures to be adopted with regard to Lord Hertford; “His imprisonment,” says he, “fatteneth him, and rather thereby hath he commodity than hindrance:” which certainly seems to have been the case. The whole letter is curious.—See *Haynes*, 396. The Secretary does not appear to have been swayed by this letter, to any greater severities.

† It seems difficult to say where Lady Catherine died. Fuller says she died in the Tower. Others say at Pyrgo; Fuller is decidedly wrong; she certainly died in private custody, according to the custom of those times, January 26, 1567. And as she was buried at Yoxford, in Suffolk, it was probably thereabouts; from Reyce’s MSS. on Suffolk Antiquities, it would appear to have been at Cockfield Hall, Sir Owen Hopton’s.—See *Nicolas’s Literary Remains of Lady Jane Grey*.



accounted for.\* On his decease, the unfortunate Lady Catherine was placed in charge of the Secretary Petre, the Earl at the time being prisoner with Sir John Mason; before her death she craved pardon of the Queen, for having contracted marriage without her knowledge, commending her children (for she bore two sons to Lord Hertford, who were afterwards declared legitimate) to her Majesty's protection, and earnestly imploring liberty for the unhappy Earl. Her sufferings were certainly great, and her punishment most severe, increased, however, probably by the injudicious interposition, and "foolish attempt," as Cecil himself called it, of her opinionated advocate Hales; knowing the character of Elizabeth, and her extreme repugnance to make any positive declaration of her heir, nothing could have been managed worse for the Lady Catherine, than to discover an heir in the son of a marriage contracted, or said to have been contracted, without her privity or consent; especially as Elizabeth herself was under a sort of promise to Mary Queen of Scots, to take no step, or encourage any proceedings tending to invalidate *her* claim, provided she might be excused from declaring her to be her heir.

It is not exactly to be known, who of the Queen's Council encouraged these severe proceedings,† but we have seen many letters in the Museum from the Grey family, to Sir William Cecil, thankfully acknowledging his good disposi-

\* The Duchess of Suffolk, her mother, daughter of Mary, Duchess of Suffolk, youngest sister of Henry VIII., died in 1563. The family was certainly extremely unfortunate. The Duke and his eldest daughter, Lady Jane, were both beheaded. Lady Catherine divorced from her first husband, and at the time of her mother's death, a prisoner in the Tower. Lady Mary, the third daughter, regardless of her high birth, married the Groom Porter at the Court, and even the Duchess herself, after the death of the Duke of Suffolk, married one Adrian Stoakes, a gentleman of no family pretensions whatsoever; "a mean gentleman," Camden calls him. After all, though the house of Suffolk had many and potent friends, the title is said to have had great and remarkable defects; for it would appear that both the Dukes of Suffolk, Brandon, who married Mary, Henry's sister, Queen Dowager of France, and Grey, who married the Lady Frances their daughter, had other wives living at the time of their marriages.—See *Memoirs of Cecil, Lord Burleigh*, &c. p. 38.

† Severe as they were, the author of the Court of Elizabeth (Miss Aikin) does not hesitate to represent them as slight or mild, compared with *the customary severity of the age*. And indeed this always deserves to be considered. It is curious that so far from Lord Hertford's heart being softened by misfortune, more than twenty-four years afterwards, he did all he could to separate his eldest son Lord Beauchamp from a wife he doated upon, on nearly the same grounds as he had been separated from Lady Catherine. Lord Beauchamp in his distress applied to Lord Burghley.—See *Strype's Annals*, iii. 507, 8, 9.

tion to serve them, and begging him to interest himself with the Queen for a pardon.\* All the letters seem to imply an affinity and relationship between the parties, the Secretary being constantly addressed as their *cousin*, and remembrances to their *cousin* Lady Cecil, being quite common. Nobody had any absolute power with Elizabeth, so that it would be wrong to conclude that Sir William, if he did not recommend, could have prevented, what took place in this melancholy affair. Lord John Grey, on an occasion formerly noticed, certainly regarded him as *one* in the Queen's Council contending against *many*, and almost every thing, in this particular case, concurs to prove, that if he could have effectually assisted the unfortunate, but devoted couple, he certainly would. The following letter transcribed from the original in the Museum† is sufficient to shew this. It is from the unhappy Lady Catherine herself, 1563. "Good *cosyne* Cecill:‡ after my very hartye commendacions to my good cosyne

\* Hales was Clerk of the Hanaper; a learned man, and devoted to the cause of the Reformation; which rendered him apprehensive of the return of Popery, if Mary's title should be acknowledged; the friends of Protestantism were generally, therefore, suspected of being the advocates of the Suffolk claims and pretensions, and this was the principal occasion of the Lord Keeper's disgrace. There was in reality no fault in the mere discussion of such a question, had not the situation of the Queen rendered it hazardous. She is even suspected of not having been so angry as she pretended to be, seeing that it might possibly stagger the confidence of the Queen of Scots, and render her more dependent on herself. Sir Thomas Smith, when made acquainted with the disturbance this business occasioned, threw out the following reflection, in one of his letters to the Secretary. "*Video periculosum esse in rebus arcanis principum et regnorum nimis velle sapere.*" "I plainly perceive how dangerous a thing it is, to be too forward in prying into the secret affairs of kings and kingdoms." The evidence upon the questions put to Hales, &c. may be seen in Haynes. Hales not only acquitted Lord John of any sinister designs, but pronounced him to be, from what he knew of him, one of the faithfulest subjects the Queen had. From this event another proof may be drawn of the difficulties of Elizabeth's situation. Had she complied with Mary's desire to be declared heir, she would have *encouraged* her Papistical and *depressed* her Protestant subjects. Had she confirmed the Suffolk claims, she would have *irritated* the Papists, and *sanctioned* the *injustice* of her *father*, of which Mary had certainly no small reason to complain; if, to accommodate these differences, she had resolved to marry, she was probably wise enough to foresee that it must be with some great sacrifice of her own importance, such as Melvil ventured to point out. "I am resolved," said she, "never to marry, if I be not necessitated thereto by the Queen (of Scots) my sister's harsh behaviour toward me. I know the truth of that, Madam, said I: you need not tell it me. Your Majesty thinks, if you were married, you would be but *Queen* of England; and now you are both *King* and *Queen*. I know your spirit cannot endure a commander."

† Lansd. MSS. ii.

‡ There was one connexion between the *families*. Lady Cecil's brother married a daughter of Lord John Grey.

your wyfe and yow, wyth lyke *thanks* for your greate friendship showed me in thys my *lords delyvery*, and *myne*,\* wyth the obtaynyng of the Quene Majesties most gracious *favor* thus farforth extended towards us. I cannot but acknowledg my selfe bounden and beholdyng to yow therefore, and as I am sure yow dout not of myne owne dear lords good wyll, for the requitall thereof to the uttermost of hys power, so I beseech yow *cosyne Cecill*, make the lyke account of me duryng life to the uttermost of my power, beseeching your farther frendship for the obtayning of the Quene Majesties most gracious pardon and favor towards me, which wyth upstreeched hands, and downe bent knees, from the bottom of my harte, most humbly I crave, thus restyng in prayer, for the Quene Majesties long raigne over us, the forgevness of myne offence, the short enjoying of my owne deare lord and husband, with assured hope, through Gods grace, and yowr good helpe, and my lord *Robert*, for the enjoying of the Quenes highnesse favor in that behalfe, I byd you my owne good cosyne most hartely farewell. From Pyrgo, the therd of September, your assured frend, and cosyne to my small power,

KATHARYNE HARTFORD."

"To my very lovyng cosyne Sir William Cecyll, Knight,  
cheefe Secretary to the Quenes Majestie, give thaes."

The very next paper in the Vol. of MSS. from which the above is extracted, is a letter from Lord John Grey to the Secretary, with a copy of his niece's letter to the Queen, which he submits to Sir William's correction, if he should find any thing amiss in it.

The next also is a letter from Lord John, beginning thus: "Cousin Cecil, my lady Catherine hath sent you and my l [ady] her cousine a Pyrgo Doo, which

\* This seems to shew that their release from the Tower was Cecil's doing, whether on occasion of the plague, or as Strype in his *Life of Parker* states it to be, on account of her own ill health there; and it would appear that Sir William had done what he could to amend her situation *in the Tower*, since there is to be found among his papers an account of the things supplied from the Queen's wardrobe for her accommodation, with the indignant remarks of some friend in the margin, as to the base quality of the articles. Some are stated to be, "ould and corse, some so broken as not to be worth tenpence, some stark naught, some nothing worth, some mean." The articles are only fourteen in all; consisting of tapestry for hangings, window curtains, quilts, bed, bolsters and pillows of down, fustian, carpets, chairs, footstools, mostly of silk or velvet. From a letter of the Council to Lord John Grey to be seen in Haynes, taken from a minute of Secretary *Cecil*, it appears that they expected, and hoped, that when she removed to Pyrgo, to be out of the way of the plague, she "would not long lack her Majesty's favour, but recover it by all good means," &c.—*Haynes*, 405.



though it cannot compare with the fattest, may well steppe forth in the middle sorte. I speak this in the praise of Pyrgo Park.

“Well good Cousin (it proceeds), her chieftest hope consisteth in you and the Counsell for the securing and full perfecting of the Queen Majesty’s most gracious favour towards her and my lord, which we daily pray for—assuredly she pines away for thought.” But to leave this sad story.

In the month of April, 1564, the Secretary appears to have received from Venice, a most curious letter writer by Dennum, who had been sent into Italy a short time before, to get intelligence of foreign conspiracies and contrivances; and who played his cards so well, in that almost necessary employ, as to obtain information, according to his own account, of what was doing in the *Vatican*. A copy of this paper was long preserved in the Queen’s private closet, but in course of time came into the hands of Sir James Ware. It appears from this report to Cecil, that Pope Pius in consultation with his Clergy, had determined, that in support of the invaded rights and jurisdictions of the Roman See, he should bestow the Queen’s realm on any Prince who would attempt to conquer it; but that previously to this, he should offer the Queen to confirm the English liturgy, some things being altered, provided she would acknowledge the same from Rome; but if denied, then to asperse the liturgy of England by all ways and conspiracies imaginable; and a license to be granted to any of the Roman orders, to preach, speak, or write against the new established Church of England, particularly abroad, to render England odious. They were to be allowed, for these purposes, to *assume* any *names* or *characters* they chose, and to correspond with the Cardinals, Archbishops, and other persons in authority under the Church of Rome.

That to prevent *bribery*, or other *false tricks*, the above licensed persons should be also carefully watched by *others*, who should in no manner discover themselves, but pretend to be strange to them, and to resort to them only as some of their converts.

We have spoken before of the extraordinary pardon to be granted to those who should assault the Queen; but dispensations also were to be secured to them for taking any oaths, even to swear to all heresies in England, with a *reserve* to help the Church of Rome, whenever opportunity should offer. This, so far from regarding as sin, or any crime against the souls of the parties, they were to account to be *meritorious*, as done with an *intention* to advance the *Roman Catholic faith*. The Romish party in England were to endeavour to

procure the Queen to marry one of the Catholic Princes ; and every individual of that party was to be subjected to excommunication and a perpetual curse, who should not do his utmost to favour and advance Mary of Scotland's pretence to the crown of England.

These articles were reported to be all actually decreed and ordered by the Pope's Council ; but as the information seems to have come from a professed spy, we must allow the Papists to question the truth of it, as many are known to do.

We must now turn to what was passing at home, where disputes were revived, that led to great disturbances and caused divisions in the newly reformed Church of England, highly gratifying to the Papists ; while it mortified in the same degree, all the zealous friends and admirers of that Church ; we allude of course, to the objections of the *precisians* (or puritans) to the habits, and other ceremonies, which the Church (and the Queen in right of her supremacy) had decreed should be retained, as harmless and indifferent in themselves, though they had been abused by the Papists ; but which abuse it appeared reasonable to think, had not so entirely contaminated them, as to render them obnoxious under a more correct form of Church Government, and a purer system of Christianity. Though these were questions for the learned only to resolve, yet it was impossible to keep the populace from interfering ; in spite of the Queen's injunctions for a strict uniformity of worship, those who had imbibed in foreign parts, at Frankfort originally, and afterwards in Switzerland, during the *Marian* persecution, an extreme hatred of all outward ornaments and distinctions, produced by their non-conformity, and rude attacks upon the Establishment, a spirit of opposition in the *people*, who took upon them to revile, and foully abuse all who wore the prescribed habits, or administered according to the Queen's injunctions.\* It is strange that wise people, and able scholars, for such there certainly were among them, should not be sensible of the advantages they were giving to the common enemy by their feuds and animosities,† and how shallow the pretence was, of

\* See Collier, ii. 494, 5.

† See on this the Answer to the Declaration of the London Clergy ; *Strype's Annals*, i. part ii. 215. There was nothing of which the Papists sought to avail themselves more, than these unhappy disputes among the Reformers. They had authority from the Pope to enter into them as parties, (see *ib.* p. 222, 3.) merely to widen the divisions, hoping the Queen herself would ultimately be so wearied of them as to return into the bosom of their Church. The Answer to the

serving God, by resisting rulers who had ordained nothing, that could by any distortion or sophistry be proved to be *sinful*;\* which had to recommend it an antiquity reaching beyond the proper æra of Popish corruptions, and which those who were for retaining, had a greater right to retain, as the heads of the Church and State, than any private individuals could have to abolish. To say the least, England was independent; had nothing to do with *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, or *Calvin*, except as far as they might happen to *agree* in their departure from the Church of Rome; and those who, after their self-banishment, came home, infected with foreign principles, deserved to be regarded as foreigners; and punished for their contempt of the royal injunctions, as enemies to the peace of the kingdom. From a full consideration of the state of the case in the outset, we cannot bring ourselves to see things in any other point of view; we would not call such persons rebels, but subjects under a grievous mistake, approaching to infatuation;† but they found fautors in the Court, and

London Clergy, is a very important publication, as drawing a distinction between the ruder and the wiser sort of the Dissenters, who questioned the habits and Ceremonies. The latter, it was observed, though they asked for a greater liberty to their own consciences, did not condemn the things themselves, nor yet the use of them, of *wickedness*. At the end of the book, are to be found many of the letters that passed upon the subject in King Edward's days, translated into English, having for the most part been written in Latin; much stress was laid upon those of Bucer and Peter Martyr, of which we have given an account in our first volume.

\* See Bullinger's admirable distinction in his reply to the question, "*An debeant Ecclesiasticis leges præscribi vestiarie, ut iis distinguantur à Laicis.*" *Burnet*, iii. part ii. 419. *Oxford edit.*

† We are not in any manner disposed to dispute the erroneous views taken at this time of the Queen's Ecclesiastical Supremacy, especially as committed in her name, by her delegates of the *High Commission Court*; nor are we insensible of the absurdity of expecting to bring all men to be of *one mind*, by an *act of uniformity* but that the interference of the Puritans with the established laws, was totally destructive of all peace, order, and decency, in the Church, is so evident from their own accounts, that it seems impossible for any reasonable person to doubt that an act of uniformity was rendered necessary by their own disorderly proceedings, in disturbance of the public mind. The following is Neal's account of the state of things in 1563, and for which he *blames* the Bishops and *conforming Clergy*, for occasioning such dissensions about a cap and a surplice; the very charge that the Bishops and conforming Clergy had so much cause to advance against the foreign precisians.

"The parochial Clergy," says he, "both in city and country had an aversion to the habits; they wore them sometimes, in obedience to the law, but more frequently administered without them; for which some were cited into the spiritual courts and admonished, the Bishops not having yet assumed the *courage* of proceeding to suspension and deprivation. At length the matter was laid before the Queen; and it was represented, that some perform divine service and



this made them bold. Leicester had pillaged the Church too much already, and looking probably to further spoliations, cared not how closely it was shorn of all outward symbols of consequence and grandeur; the lower it was reduced, the richer he and his dependants might become; and these foreign lovers of simplicity were likely to do his work for him. Sir Francis Knolles, the Queen's near relative, was a friend to them also; upon a better principle, perhaps, but one not less uncompromising, or severe; so that the party from the very beginning held its head high, and was not indeed to be despised, as insignificant, on the score of learning, or generally speaking, virtuous intentions.

It has been thought, that the Queen on her visit to Cambridge, had given offence to *Thomas Cartwright*, engaged in a public disputation with Preston, her Majesty having so highly complimented the latter as to excite the jealousy of Cartwright, and lay the foundation for all the troublesome contests which we shall find to have ensued; dreadfully to the annoyance of the Secretary, for a long series of years, if not indeed to the very end of his life. But Cartwright, however conspicuous he became afterwards, was not the first public delinquent. There were two at Oxford, who may be said to have begun the troubles of this reign, it being judged right to bring them before the Queen's Commissioners; Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, and Humphrey, President of Magdalen College; they were pressed by the Commissioners with the opinions of Bucer and Peter Martyr, of which we have given an account in our first volume, in the case of Bishop Hooper; but all in vain. They were told, they must relin-

prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church; some in a seat made in the church, some in the pulpit with their faces to the people; some keep precisely to the order of the book, some intermix psalms in metre; some say with a surplice, and others without one—that some administer the Communion with surplice and cap; some with surplice alone; others with none; some with chalice, others with a communion cup, others with a common cup; some with unleavened bread, and some with leavened—some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting; some baptize in a font, some in a bason; some sign with the sign of a cross, others sign not; some minister in scholar's cloaths, some in others.” Surely instead of this horrible confusion, an act of uniformity might have appeared a blessing. And the whole objection to the habits was, that they had been abused to the purposes of Popery; but so had the churches and the pulpits, to which they laid such claim, and thought it so hard to be suspended from the use of them. One of the reasons urged by them against wearing the habits was, that “Popish garments have many superstitious mystical significations, for which purpose they are consecrated by the Papists; we ought therefore to consecrate them also, or lay them wholly aside.”—Why so? would not the omission to consecrate them, take off much of their former superstitious mystical signification?

quish their appointments; and Sampson, indeed, was deprived in June, 1565. Humphrey did by no means act so decidedly, but connived for some time.

As these two divines had been urged with the opinions of Bucer and Peter Martyr,\* both deceased, they judged it not amiss to apply to Bullinger† and Gualter, the living fathers of the Swiss congregation, and the great friends of the deceased Bishop Hooper; but the answers of both dissuaded them from quitting the ministry for things that did not wound the conscience,‡ and admonished them to submit, if upon application to the crown they could not be excused. The particular questions submitted to Bullinger, may be seen in Strype, with Bullinger's excellent answers, in Gualter's name, as well as his own, *all in favour of conformity*. One expression used by him is exceedingly good: § he admonished that no man should *frame a conscience to himself*, ἐκ φιλονεικίας, out of a love of contest—an admonition admirably suited to the occasion.|| Some

\* In their letters written to Hooper and Alasco. See vol. i. ch. 24. anno 1550.

† In Bullinger's letter, to be seen in Burnet, vol. iii. Records, No. lxxvii., he particularly begins with stating, that he could find nothing to add to what had repeatedly been advanced upon the subject by Peter Martyr, both while he resided at Oxford, as well as after his retirement to the Continent. "Ad hanc quæstionem brevibus tibi respondendum putavi, nam brevibus meam sententiam dicere potui; dum sciebam beatæ memoriæ D. Pet. Martyrem et Oxoniæ et hic eandem quæstionem tractavisse sæpius et fusius, quibus quod adjicerem non habebam." He does however in this letter go more largely into the subject, but with singular prudence and judgment. Mr. Hallam, in his Constitutional History of England, speaking of the objections of the Helvetic divines to the habits, does not sufficiently apprise the reader that though they objected, they recommended conformity.—See pp. 110, 111.

‡ They wrote also to Beza, who was inclined to take their part, but knowing that the church of Geneva lay under a cloud, in Elizabeth's eyes, which was not the case with the congregation at Zurich, he wrote to Bullinger, wishing him actually to send Gualter to England to assist the Precisians.

§ Annals, ch. xlii.\*Repository, No. xxiv. vol. i. part. ii. p. 139. Oxford Edit.

Upon the question of the attire belonging to the service of God, Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, b. ii. § 29. should by all means be consulted, and Strype's Life of Grindal, 1566.

|| Sampson and Humphrey, in their first letter to the Archbishop and Commissioners, seem almost to convict themselves of harbouring such a *conscience*; observing, "Before God, what a bitter grief it was to them that there should be a dissension between them for so *small* a matter, as *propter lanam et linum*, woollen and linen, as they styled the cap and surplice." If the matter were so *small*, surely the call upon them to render obedience to the Queen's injunctions, should have given them a conscience the other way. In this letter they speak of the law, as "*restoring* the ceremonies of the Romish Church, joined with the hazard of slavery, necessity, and superstition;" but this is wrong—not discarding what had been in use, is different from *restoring*;



of the *Bishops* also applied to their friends at Zurich for advice and directions; and Bullinger, the *Oraculum Ecclesiarum*, as Jewel was used to call him, answered them with great good sense and moderation.

An account both of Sampson and Humphrey (or Humfrey) the ὑπερασπισται, or *champions of the Puritans*, as Strype calls them, may be seen in the work already referred to, ch. xliii. It will there be found that Humphrey, for his great learning,\* was much esteemed by Secretary *Cecil*, by whose means he was

and as to the hazard of slavery, necessity, and superstition, if obedience to national laws be slavery and necessity, who can be free from them? Superstition is different: superstition is false devotion, and may affect the conscience; but what false devotion could there be in wearing caps, and hoods, and surplices? Men do not worship these things. They go on to say, "Because this does not seem so to you, you are not to be condemned by us; because this does seem so to us, we are not to be vexed by you." A good maxim enough as a preamble to an act of toleration, but destructive of all uniformity and regularity where an absolute separation of churches is not contemplated. And surely no two persons could have been more in the way of marking this difference, as Heads of Colleges in an University; where, though the *several* societies may be governed by *private* statutes of their own, with regard to the *public* statutes of the *University*, they are all expected to render a like obedience. There is much learning displayed in the letter, for they were certainly very learned persons, but they did not keep to the exact point. The letter may be seen in the Appendix to Strype's Life of Parker, taken from a copy endorsed by *Cecil* as follows: "Supplicatio Tho. Sampson, et Laurentii Humfrey ad Arch. Cantuar. Episcopos London. Wynton. Eliensem, Lincolnensem, 20 Martii, 1564."

In Bullinger's letter, to which we have already referred, there is one passage so exceedingly good, that we cannot omit transcribing it; it is in answer to the question proposed by Sampson and Humphrey, "An vestitum cum Papistis communicare liceat?"

Resp: "Nondum constat Papam discrimen vestium induxisse in Ecclesiam, imò discrimen vestium constat Papa esse longè vetustius. Nec video, cur non liceat vestitu non superstitioso sed politiore et composito, communicare cum Papistis. Si nulla re cum illis communicare liceret, oporteret, et templa omnia deserere, nulla accipere stipendia, non uti Baptismo, non recitare symbolum apostolorum, et Nicænum, adeoque abjicere orationem Dominicam. Neque vos mutuatis ab eis ullas ceremonias. Res vestiaria ab initio Reformationis nunquam fuit abolita, et retinetur adhuc non lege Papistica, sed vi edicti regii, ut res media et politica." There is more to be found of the true history of the English Reformation in this short passage, than in any other perhaps that could be produced.—*Burnet*, iii. part 2, No. lxxvii. We cannot bring ourselves to think that the reply of our two English precisians to this letter, No. lxxviii., gives them any advantage over the discreet Pastor of Zurich. No wonder therefore that the latter should wish, as he expresses himself, No. lxxx., to withdraw from such unpleasant, and, as he calls them, "*nunquam terminandis disputationibus*." But we must do all the parties the justice to observe, that the question of the habits only was in the view of Bullinger.

\* See, for a list of his writings, *Annals*, i. part ii. 146.



ultimately brought to conform, and preferred so highly, as to die Dean of Winchester in the year 1589. Sampson was equally well known to *Cecil*: he had married a niece of *Latimer's*, had received ordination in the year 1550, at the hands of *Ridley*, and was known to and esteemed both by him and *Cranmer*. In King Edward's time he was Dean of Chichester and Rector of Allhallows, London. He preached after at Paul's Cross, on the Queen's accession; and in 1560, the Deanery of Christ Church being vacant, many eminent members of that society petitioned Lord Leicester to procure him the appointment, as a good man, a great linguist, scholar, and divine. After he had been Dean some time, in December 1563, *Cecil* strongly urged him to comply with the habits, telling him that "he gave offence by his disobedience," and reminding him that "obedience was better than sacrifice." His long answer to the Secretary, desiring to be excused, may be seen in Strype [*ut supra*]. Though he lost the Deanery, through his pertinacity, he obtained an Hospital in London, called Whittington College, where, with the assistance of Lord *Burghley*, he was able to do much good, and for which, as he wrote to that Lord, all the poor there prayed for his Lordship; but we shall have more to say of him hereafter.

The Secretary had great trouble with his own College at Cambridge, St. John's, where, in the year 1565, many of the young men persisted in throwing aside their surplices, hoods, &c.: nor were they properly reprov'd by the master; but upon the Secretary's being informed of it, he instantly wrote to them, charging them with vain-glory, an affectation of popularity, a contempt of the laws, and a rash desire of innovating; but to all these remonstrances they pleaded conscience,\* which greatly offended the Queen, and moved the Chancellor to summon the Head of the College to London, who thereupon, though reluctantly, recanted.

The Chancellor wrote also at considerable length to his old friend the Bishop of Ely, visitor of the College, who endeavoured, in that capacity, to restore tranquillity, but in vain. Letters were sent up, "written in very unbecoming language," as Strype observes, "both to the Queen and the Chancellor; but by more thoughtful and prudent persons they were stayed, and a more submissive

\* We may guess how far this plea of conscience was available to the purposes of the young men, when it is recorded as a fact, that one being chid by the Head of his College for appearing without a surplice in the College Chapel, excused himself by saying that his *conscience* would not give him leave to wear one; whereas it was well known at the time that he had indulged his palate a little beyond his means, and been obliged to pawn his surplice to the cook.

address forwarded to *Cecil*, with many names subscribed, imploring more liberty to tender consciences; but the Chancellor was angry to find among the names that of one of the Heads of the Colleges, who excused himself by declaring that, for his own part, he wore the habits. But though many grave men in the place lamented the contentions that had sprung up, they could not be allayed; and the London clergy, some of whom had also been called before the Commissioners, set forth a book entering largely into argument upon all the points in controversy, but which it would be much beyond our purpose to notice further, as other authors have fully done so; and though scarcely any thing passed without trouble to the *Secretary*, and continual appeals to his judgment or influence with her Majesty, to mediate between the parties,\* yet it cannot be expected that we should enter into a full discussion of the many points referred to him.† In our first volume, in the reign of Edward, and in the case of Bishop Hooper, we took occasion to explain, if not fully, yet sufficiently for general readers, the grounds of this most unpleasant and tedious dispute; and those who wish to go farther into the subject, may assuredly find sufficient to satisfy their curiosity in the voluminous writings of that generally correct, diligent, and indefatigable ecclesiastical historian, Strype. Such passages, as in a more particular manner relate to the Secretary, it will of course be our duty not entirely to pass over. In 1564, 1565, a dispute arose between Horn, Bishop of Winchester, and a person we have often had occasion to mention in our first volume, Feckenham, Dean of St. Paul's, under *Mary*, and Abbot of the

\* The Secretary's part was the more difficult, because he had a private respect for the men, and they were notoriously upheld by those at Court, who were jealous of the Secretary's influence; but that he was in any way disposed himself to *encourage* their disobedience or non-conformity to the laws, appears to be a very wrong conclusion; in fact, when the Archbishop and Bishops drew up against the dissenting clergy what they modestly called their *advertisements*, rather than *ordinances* (because the Queen was persuaded to withhold her royal sanction for their publication, though they had been drawn up by her direction), they were set forth by the Archbishop on the suggestion of *Cecil*.—See *Collier*, ii. 496.

† Before the judiciary proceedings in the business, the question of Conformity was amicably but learnedly discussed between the Archbishop and the two Heads of Colleges. The questions of the Archbishop, which were previously submitted to *Cecil*, may be seen in Strype's *Life of Parker*, book ii. ch. 23, with the answers of Sampson and Humphrey, and much more to the purpose; the Secretary, in all instances, appearing to have been consulted by the Archbishop; and, indeed, all the papers from which Strype, and we may add, Collier, made their collections, seem to have been in *Cecil's* keeping, being severally indorsed in his own hand-writing. See our first volume, chap. xxiv.



new founded Abbey of Westminster. In 1564, Feckenham had put forth, among his friends, a work on the Oath of Supremacy, which he called a *Declaration*. The book had been written in the Tower, where he was a prisoner during the sitting of the Parliament, in the fifth year of the Queen's reign; which book, afterwards, while, according to the manner of those days, he was in the private custody of the Bishop of Winchester, he put into the Bishop's hands, to shew what his opinion had long been upon points on which they disagreed. This book he afterwards published, adding, however, to the Bishop's great surprise, what he had not seen before, that it purported to be a declaration of stays and scruples of conscience, touching the Oath of Supremacy, delivered unto the Lord Bishop of Winchester. This offended the Bishop, and induced him to answer Feckenham; which answer was printed in the year 1565. The *Secretary*, hearing of the dispute, and of Feckenham's writings, sent for the latter, which were transmitted to him accordingly, and accompanied with a letter from Feckenham himself, to be seen in Strype, and in which he stated to the Secretary his own ideas of the dispute. The Bishop had this advantage over Feckenham, that whatever stays or scruples concerning the Oath of Supremacy might influence him at this time, he had certainly been one of those who acknowledged the regal supremacy under Henry and Edward; but in other points, as happens in all controversies, each party claimed the victory, for Feckenham would not yield, but, indeed, conducted himself very strangely and unmannerly, as the Bishop was obliged to tell him; for, during one of their disputes, he was carried so far as to pronounce *Jewel*, of all people in the world, to be utterly *unlearned*, and his book against Harding, published about this time, *erroneous*, *filthy*, and *blasphemous*. We should not, perhaps, have noticed this dispute, but to shew how attentive to all such matters, in the midst of other business, the *Secretary* constantly shewed himself to be, and how ready all parties were to put their case into his hands whenever an opportunity was afforded them. Feckenham must have been personally well known to *Cecil*, having, in the reign of Edward, been one who carried on a disputation on the subject of the Eucharist at *Cecil's* own house, while the latter was Secretary of State, as we have shewn in our first volume; and, generally speaking, he was certainly accounted a "learned and good man," as Camden calls him. We have spoken in our first volume of his discourses with Lady Jane Grey previous to her execution.

Another correspondent the Secretary had at this time, who seems to have en-



tertained an extravagant conceit, or plan, for composing what he called, the grievous discord and schism in the church; and he wished to submit a specimen of his work, "*Scopus et finis instituti operis, &c.*" to his good judgment and opinion. His project appears to have been no better than a somewhat circuitous mode of re-establishing the absolute power of the Pope upon the authority of the Scriptures, but of the plan itself we have nothing to say; Strype's account, however, of the author and his acquaintance with *Cecil* is worth transcribing, as affording us some light, with regard to former times, and the Secretary's acquaintance with Cardinal Pole.

"One *Dominicus Sampsonius*, a learned man of Bruges, in Flanders, and secretary to the Bishop and Prince of Liege, formerly scribe and servant to Cardinal Pole in England, writes a letter this year to Secretary *Cecil*; enclosing therein a design of his, for the composition of the present differences in religion; and to introduce this, he reminded the Secretary, how dear he had been formerly both to him and his Lady, as well as to many other learned and good men here in England, on account of his learning; and how he, the said Secretary, had, upon the Cardinal's death, endeavoured to persuade him to stay in England with promise of preferment; and the like had many others done; and therefore that he had not departed out of so pleasant a country, and from so many good friends, had his conscience permitted him to approve of that religion, in all things that was then set up; and which the Secretary, he said, in a very accurate discourse had moved him to embrace, as he himself had done."

At this time many pernicious books began to be sent into England, by the refugee Papists in Flanders; particularly from Antwerp, where several of the most active opposers of the English Reformation had taken up their abode, and where, to give greater spirit and energy to their machinations against the reformed, King Philip had given them the support and countenance of a regular court of *Inquisition*, upon pretext of the Council of Trent; though in open violation of promises on the part of himself, as well as his father, that under no pretext or colour whatsoever, his subjects in the Low Countries should be burthened with the Inquisition, and in fact, in contempt of all the charters of their liberty, sanctioned and assured to them by the *Golden bull* granted to the country of Brabant in the year 1349, and successively by the Emperors. The alarmed commonalty and burgesses of the town of Antwerp, being a free people, according to the constitution of the country, loudly protested against it, in a supplication addressed to the burgomasters and council of the town. This protest

is to be seen in Strype, [*Annals*, vol. i. part. ii. Appendix No. xxxiii.] being, as he tells us, the very translated copy once belonging to Secretary *Cecil*, and to which his own hand is indorsed.—It is short, but strong to the purpose.

We have a curious testimony borne to the zealous protestantism of the Secretary, in the following circumstance, arising out of the death of one Caryl, attorney of the Duchy Court of Lancaster, a learned and good man but a Papist; as most of his profession seemed at this time to be;\* to the great mortification, as it would seem, of the celebrated John Hales, who, while Caryl lay on his death-bed, and to prevent if he could, the appointment of a Popish successor, laboured earnestly with the Secretary to procure George Bromley to be appointed, a good lawyer as he represented him to be, but above all, “as good a *Protestant*.” “Such men,” says he, in his application to *Cecil*, “of right and conscience should be remembered, and by all means furthered;” he knew the Secretary loved such men, and was desirous to further them; adding, “that he should hereby win the hearts of a great many Protestants, who now discouraged, would take some hope, if they might hear a Protestant lawyer bore some authority in Westminster Hall.”

The Secretary received also another application about the same time (so invariably had he become the resort of all parties), from Richard Tracy, Esq. of a good family in Gloucestershire, to procure him to use his influence with the Queen, to have the crucifix removed from her closet, which it seems continued to give great offence to the precise party; but it had no immediate effect. The letter may be seen in Strype [*Annals*, i. ch. xlvi.] the Queen however was defended by Calphil, in answer to Martial, as too well instructed to fall into any Popish error or idolatry, by retaining the crucifix—she having no *such* affiance in the cross, as Martial in his book did fondly teach.

The Dean of Westminster, Dr. Gabriel Goodman, a great friend and favourite of the Secretary, did this year also apply to him strongly, to procure that no wrong might be done to the charitable foundation of the Savoy, by a projected exchange of lands, so common in those days. This also we only mention, to shew how generally it was the custom at this time, to appeal to the Secretary in all difficult or doubtful cases.

In Strype's *Annals* of the Reformation, from which we have taken and selected many of the foregoing particulars, (for who can have been more

\* The Magistrates and Judges, we are told by *Camden*, continued friendly to Popery.

diligent, or, *generally speaking*, more correct in such researches?) we discover an error, under the year 1565, exceedingly remarkable. In his xlviiith chapter, vol. i. part ii., Oxford edition, the following passage is to be found; speaking of Scotch affairs.

“In May or June the two Queens had an interview. They either satisfied themselves with the interview, or rather filled the desires of their trains. There were sundry expectations of the fruit thereof; and, as was most commonly used in Princes causes no small things projected. Queen Elizabeth was now it seems in her progress in the North.” As no authority is cited for this, we are unable to trace the mistake to its root; but that the two Queens ever did really meet, we conceive to be entirely untrue. Nor do we know what is meant by Queen Elizabeth’s progress in the North. Had the projected interview between the two Queens come to pass, Nottingham Castle appears to have been chosen as the *place* of their meeting; and this indeed seems at one time to have been so entirely expected, that I have seen among the MSS. in the Museum a paper endorsed by *Cecil*, purporting to be “Devises to be shewed before the Queen at Nottingham, after the meeting of the Queen of Scots.” But we cannot believe that the two Queens did ever really meet, or see each other.



## CHAP. VII.

1566.

Eighth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, commenced November 17, 1565.

*Pope Pius V. chosen—Order of St. Michael sent to England—David Rizzio and Darnley—Murray—Randolph—Hazardous state of England—Character of the Scots—The Lennoxes—Randolph's letter—Marriage of Mary and Darnley—Protestant party low in Scotland—Copy of the Catholic league sent to Mary—Darnley and Mary on bad terms—Murder of Rizzio—Conæus upon it—Bothwell in favour—Birth of James—Melvil's mission to England—Elizabeth receives the news from Cecil—Account of Ruxby, Cecil's Spy—Cecil's letter to him—Ruxby's letter to Cecil—Rapin's correct account of things—Baptism of James VI.—Earl of Bedford sent by Elizabeth—Mary a dangerous rival at all times to Elizabeth—Bothwell in great favour—Darnley goes to Glasgow—Is sullen and not to be appeased—State of the Low Countries—Cardinal Granvelle very unpopular—Brabanters alarmed—The Queen visits Oxford—Parliament assembled—Proceedings about the succession—Parliament dissolved—Bull of Pope Pius V.—Account of Saravia.*

THE first entry in Lord Burghley's notes for the year 1566 (or to be more correct, 1565-6), is as follows :—

“Jan. 7. Alexander Cardinalis was chosen Pope, and named *Pius Quintus*.”

The name of this new Pope was Michael Ghisleri : he was the son of a senator of Milan, and born in the year 1504. His predecessor will always be memorable for the termination of the Council of Trent during his Pontificate, his confirmation and publication of the decrees of that celebrated Council, and for the creed which to this day bears his name, and which, having been published in the year 1564, in the form of a Bull, is acknowledged, as we before observed, by the most modern Romanists, to exhibit, at this very time, “an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman Catholic faith.”—[*Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, 1825.] Of Pius V. we shall have more to say as we proceed. It was nothing in his favour, at the period of his elevation, that he should have been Commissary-General of the Court of Inquisition at Rome ; and indeed he never seems to have abandoned the horrid principles of the school he came from.

On January 11, Lord Burghley notices the arrival of M. Rambouillet, with the order of France for the Duke of Norfolk and Earl of Leicester.\*

This was the order of St. Michael, the "Cockle-shelled" order, as Camden calls it, from the collar worn by the Knights, consisting of double escallop shells, fastened with double knotted gold twist, interwoven in the manner of true lovers' knots, with a medallion representing St. Michael and the Dragon. It was instituted in 1469, and for more than a century held in high esteem. Elizabeth is said to have considered this embassy as a high honour, especially as no Englishman had ever before been chosen into that order, but her father Henry VIII., her brother Edward VI.,† and her uncle, by marriage, Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. She selected therefore among her subjects, as Camden relates, Leicester as most dear to her, Norfolk as most noble, and they were regularly invested with it accordingly, in the Queen's Court at Westminster, after Rambouillet himself had been installed as Knight of the Garter, in St. George's Chapel at Windsor, as the representative of his royal master Charles IX. The order of St. Michael, after this, fell so soon into disgrace, comparatively, that the Queen herself, we are told, was grieved and mortified to see it. In Clark's History of Knighthood, published in 1784, it is particularly said to have fallen into such disrepute, as to be conferred only on artists, physicians, and magistrates of municipal towns, who sought to obtain it merely for the purpose of ennobling their descendants.

The next entry of any importance in Lord Burghley's notes, is to the following effect:—

"March 20. M. David, the Scotts Queen Secretary, slaine in Scotland;" which naturally brings us back to the affairs of that divided and unhappy kingdom.

We have already spoken of David Rizzio, but must here enter a little farther into his history. He was the son of a musician at Turin, and came first into Scotland in the suite of the Count de Mureto, ambassador to that country. having a great knowledge of music, he got acquainted with the court musicians; and the Queen wanting a bass voice in her concerts, desired the Ambassador to leave him with her. Having often the opportunity of seeing and conversing with the Queen, he so insinuated himself into her good graces, that his credit at Court seemed to increase every day; and the Secretary of the French dispatches,

\* See also a letter from him to Lord Cobham upon the subject.—*Haynes*, 443.

† See vol. i.

being obliged to return to his own country, Rizzio was appointed to supply his place. From this time he pushed his fortune so successfully, that he became, in a manner, first Minister; nothing of any moment being transacted at Court but by or through him. Buchanan's insinuations concerning this intimacy are well known: we are far from wishing to revive them;\* but we have an account extant, of the excess of his arrogance and familiarity, not well to be disputed. It is the testimony indeed of Melvil, Mary's own servant and minister, the very person who endeavoured to convince the Queen of the hazard she ran in giving him such encouragement, but without effect. The story is too important to our purposes to be omitted. "As he [Rizzio]," says Melvil,† "entered in greater credit, so he had not the prudence how to manage it rightly; for frequently, in presence of the Nobility, he would be publicly speaking to the Queen, even when there was greatest conventions of the estates, which made him to be much envied and hated, especially when he became so great that he presented all signatures to be subscribed by her Majesty;‡ so that some of the Nobility would frown upon him, others would shoulder and shut him by, when they entered the Queen's chamber, and found him always speaking with her. All who had business at Court, addressing themselves to him, and depending upon him, he soon became very rich; as he was a known minion, and suspected to be a pensioner of the Pope,§ it gave ground of suspicion that some design would be by him contrived against the reformed religion."||

\* See Malcolm Laing's Dissertation on the Murder of Darnley, p. 30, note 8.

† We are aware that Melvil's testimony is disputed, by some who are unwilling to let it stand in the way of their own theories; but we must give up all history if we are expected to yield to every objection of this nature. Where contradiction exists, we must decide as fairly as we can. We think Melvil in this instance correct.

‡ Bishop Grindall, writing to Bullinger at Zurich, Aug. 27, 1566, says, "*Perscribitur ad me ex Scotiâ, Reginæ cum Rege minime convenire. Causa hæc est: fuit Italus quidam, nomine David, à Cardinale Lotharingo Reginæ Scotiæ commendatus. Is quum Reginæ à secretis atque intimis esset consiliis, fere solus omnia administrabat, non consulto Rege, qui ad modum juvenis et levis est. Hoc male habebat Regem, Itaque factâ conspiratione,*" &c. &c.

§ Strype says (Annals, 1566), he was recommended to Mary by her uncle, the Cardinal of Lorrain. See Grindal's letter also. It is probable the Cardinal knew that the Pope communicated with him, and had the French Secretary displaced, to make room for Rizzio in the Queen's Court or household.

|| We are very accidentally informed of one trait in his character, in a letter from Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, to Bullinger, dated Aug. 21, 1566. He was it seems a necromancer, wizard, or cunning man, as it was the fashion to call them. The Bishop's words are these: "*Italus*



Melvil had been desired by Mary herself to tell her of her faults; but when he remonstrated upon this point, it was taken ill; and when he afterwards tried to check Rizzio, the latter told him he had the Queen's order to behave as he was accustomed to do, without minding any thing.

It is surely impossible to deny the extreme imprudence of this conduct on the part of Mary. It is impossible, one would think, to deny, that Murray\* and all the Protestant Lords, had reason to be disgusted with the officiousness and insolence of this ignoble foreigner; but when this pensioner of the Pope, was seen to be a favourer and abettor of Mary's marriage, with a Roman Catholic youth of eighteen, the dangers to which they were likely to be exposed must forcibly have struck them. They remonstrated all they could, against the marriage, but the Queen told them, things were gone too far to be broken off; and the marriage, as we have shewn, was consummated on the 29th of July, 1565, and Darnley proclaimed King on the 30th. But in order to understand aright what passed subsequently to this fatal union, it is quite necessary to revert to some of the proceedings previous to that event.

Hitherto Mary, directed and supported by the administration of Murray, had led a life of comparative ease and respectability; she had rendered herself popular amongst her subjects, in general; and Murray, so far from subjecting her to the austerities of his own Church, had indulged her in a life of gaiety, exceedingly obnoxious to the clergy of the Calvinistic school; but the moment he began to thwart her views of marrying Darnley, he fell into disgrace, and she soon shewed him, how determined she was to go to extremities, if he and his party persisted in their objections. Had Darnley been wise, amiable, or

quidam, vocatus Senior David, necromanticæ artis peritus, in magnam gratiam apud Reginam Scotiæ," &c.—*Burnet*, vol. iii. part 2. Records, No. xci. The Bishop was writing of the death of Rizzio, and to shew how strangely men's minds were perverted, or hardened, or at least *not softened by refinement*, in those days, he thus adverts to one of the name of *Black*, who was murdered at the same time: "Fraterculus quidam, nomine *Black* (niger visularius) Papistarum antesignanus, eodem tempore in aula occiditur:

Sic NIGER hic nebulo, NIGRA quoque morte peremptus,

Invitus NIGRUM subito descendit in orcum."

This Bishop might surely have spared his puns on such an occasion, but he was of the Knoxian school, and a bitter adversary to the Church of Rome.

\* Murray fell into disgrace with Mary, as Buchanan says, for not paying such attentions to Rizzio as others of the court did, vol. ii. 300. This is another disputed authority, which however we cannot bring ourselves always to disregard on that account.

respectable, things might, perhaps, have taken a different turn, but he very soon discovered himself to be any thing but wise, or amiable, or even respectable; his close intimacy with Rizzio, was quite sufficient to sink him in the estimation of the Nobles. After he had been little more than four months in Scotland, and only one month before his marriage, Randolph wrote to Cecil, "People have small joy in this, their new master, and find nothing but that God must find him a short end, or them a miserable life; the dangers of those he now hateth are great; but they find some support, that what he intendeth to others may light upon himself;" and on the 2d of July following, just after the marriage, "With my Lord of Murray I have lately spoken; he is grieved to see the extreme follies of his Sovereign; he lamenteth the state of the country, that tendeth to utter ruin; he feareth that the Nobility should be forced to assemble themselves together, to do her honour and reverence, as in duty bound; but at the same time to provide for the state, that it do not utterly perish. The Duke, the Earl of Argyle, and he (Murray), concur in this device; many others are like to join in the same device, what will ensue, let wise men judge."

We know how these passages have been perverted, to implicate Randolph and Cecil, as being the absolute instigators of all the mischief that ensued, and if not the original authors, the abettors of the very worst acts, that in the course of things, were perpetrated by the parties. Randolph, in our own opinion, was giving to *Cecil*, as his office called upon him to do, correct information of what he was in the way to hear and to see. The prospect, indeed, was sufficiently gloomy, but they must know little of the character of those times, and the state of Scotland under the circumstances in which she then stood, who are surprised at Randolph's representation of the dangers and confusion to be apprehended, without any furtherance from England; and why are we bound to interpret the expressions used to the discredit of Murray? he "feareth," and "lamenteth," the probability of their being driven to extremities, to save their country from "utterly perishing;" he speaks of the "honour and reverence" they were "in duty bound" to pay to the Queen. But, says one remarker upon these passages,\* "how the ruin of the state was to ensue from this marriage, founded to all appearance upon principles both wise and salutary to the state, and approved by all good men, is not so easy to be apprehended." This is surely a most strange remark, if meant to refer to the parties as well as the contract. Knox had already, in his coarse and severe manner, deprecated the government of "Boys"

\* Tytler, vol. i. 373.

and "Women;" and though it was pretended by Knox himself, that the application had been overstrained, yet, of Darnley's *boyhood*, as disqualifying him for the good government of such a kingdom, at such a time, there can be no doubt. He was not more than eighteen; and very soon gave proofs of the impetuosity of his temper, by nearly murdering Lord Ruthven, for having merely hinted to him; that some delay had been suggested, as to the Queen's conferring on him the title of Duke of Albany; he was a Catholic, besides, or quite ready to profess himself to be such; and had many family spoliations and injuries to revenge. Here surely was ground enough for the apprehension of evil, without any stimulation or excitement on the part of England. All this time, it is alleged, Mary was "the darling of her people, her government being mild and unexceptionable to all;" but this surely reflects some credit, at least (though Robertson has been abused for saying something like it), on *Murray*, who had been her Minister, and might or should serve rather to justify his fears of a change, to the disadvantage of his country, than to convict him of a blind and base pursuit of his own ends. "The only grievance," says one of Mary's advocates, "complained of by Murray and his associates, seems to be, that the Queen should think of *marrying*, which they foresaw might put an end to that party, in the *English interest*, which Elizabeth cherished and kept up for the *purpose of disturbing Mary's Government*, and of which Murray, for his own private views, was the head."\* If a

\* It is curious that at this very time, so far from his seeking his own private ends, or the ends of his party, by *thwarting Mary*, or interfering with her private inclinations, he was in dire disgrace with the Clergy, *Knox* particularly, for being *too much devoted to Mary*, and servile in his *compliances*. And this rupture, which, as Robertson observes, is a strong proof of Murray's sincere attachment to the Queen at that period, continued above a year and a half. It is, however, extremely difficult to clear the character of any person implicated in the affairs of Scotland at this time. Notwithstanding the above quarrel, and Murray's indulgence towards Mary in regard to the mass, and other things, against the will of the Clergy, he is accused by some of being all the while the instigator of all the attacks upon her, or her religion, by Knox and others, and giving his support to all their rude speeches against her. And again in regard to Darnley, it has been said, that his enmity towards him was a plain proof that he aimed at the crown, and had nothing in view but his own selfish ends. "Il ne pouvoit regarder ce mariage," says one, "comme une folie, que relativement à la ruine de ses intérêts, et cela seul est une preuve contre lui: Car *nul intérêt légitime* ne pouvoit le rendre ennemi du mari que la reine devoit choisir." (*Rech. hist. sur Marie*, p. 181.) To shew how difficult it is to write history, Dr. Cook of Laurencekirk, in his History of the Reformation in Scotland, gives Murray the credit of having *wished* the Queen to marry Darnley, for fear the latter should, by marrying elsewhere, intercept the views that Mary had upon the crown of England; instead therefore of seeking to deprive her of one crown, he



man be so to abandon all private views, on public occasions, as to have no feeling or consideration, for *loss of credit*, loss of *power*, and perhaps, loss of *life*, then indeed Murray may have been to blame, but having hitherto served Mary faithfully, he could not be expected very easily to brook the exaltation of such a youth, to his own immediate depression, and the ruin of the cause he had so anxiously supported. If Murray, standing at the head of his party, is to be supposed to have had nothing in view, but his own private ends of ambition, and jealousy of Mary, it might be asked, how it happened, that the latter should have reigned four years in such credit and safety, under Murray's administration, as to have ingratiated herself with all classes of persons, as her advocates insist, receiving all the while from Murray himself, all due respect and honour?

Of Murray's dislike to her marriage with Darnley, we might form a different opinion, if prejudices did not interpose, from another letter of Randolph's, cited by Mary's advocates, for the very purpose of shewing, that England was privy to a whole series of "black designs, which lay brooding at the heart of this bastard brother of the Queen;" from the first moment that her marriage was hinted at, "Darnley's behaviour," says Randolph, in his letter to *Cecil* of the 2d of July, "is such, as he is run in contempt of all men; even of those that were his chief friends; what shall become of him I know not, but it *is greatly to be feared* that he can have no long life among *this people*." Here we see, that not Murray only, nor Murray's friends, but Darnley's own friends and adherents were so disgusted with his manners, as to quit him with contempt—so much for the marriage, still alleged to have been "*approved by all good men*." It is impossible to deny, that we are now touching upon one of the darkest and most distressing periods of English history; we may well wish that England could have stood clear of the disasters that befel Scotland; but upon a full view of the case, we have been regularly brought to the conclusion, that every thing at home was at stake, from the first moment of Mary's return to her own dominions—that upon the dreadful *necessity* of upholding a party there, against

was anxious, according to Dr. Cook, to secure to her *two*. The fact is, Murray did not so much object to the match, as to the person chosen, after he became acquainted with his character; and then it is but fair to think, he might have felt for his country, as well as for himself. Dr. Cook in proof of his assertions has copied a very curious letter from Randolph to Queen Elizabeth, and which certainly seems to support the conclusions he has drawn, as to the sentiments of Murray and Lethington, previous to the conference at Berwick; leaving Elizabeth's own secret purposes as to the offer of *Leicester*, as obscure and impenetrable as ever.—See vol. iii. Appendix, No. xiii. p. xlix.

French ambition and Popish vengeance, depended the security of Elizabeth, the repose of her kingdom, the stability of her throne, the freedom and happiness of the people, and the permanent establishment of a Protestant Church in both kingdoms. The smallest advantage gained in Scotland by the two combined interests mentioned above (French ambition and Popish vengeance), would, at this time, have brought into danger every blessing we have enumerated. We may add, for it is certainly another point claiming deep consideration, that the party in favour with England was neither to be abandoned or offended with impunity. If they were once alienated from Elizabeth, they were likely not merely to cease to be friends, but to become enemies as well as the rest of their countrymen.

Randolph was upon the spot, to observe the course of things, and *Cecil* at the Court to receive *his* information; but it does not follow, that whatever took place there, was positively directed by English counsels. Darnley's folly and bad manners, for instance, must have been totally unconnected with any thing devised by England; and the alarm excited by those bad manners, in a youth destined to share the Sovereignty in such very critical times, natural under all circumstances to every well-wisher to Scotland; but palpably full of danger to the whole Protestant party, who soon found that all their remonstrances were vain; he and his father had been recalled by Elizabeth as English subjects, and had declared their determination to continue in Scotland, and in allegiance to *Mary*. The case, therefore, became to Murray and his associates desperate, and we must not wonder at the confusion that ensued. "It is greatly to be feared," Randolph wrote, "that he can have no long life among *this people*." The character of *the people* did certainly not depend upon England, and we must remember, that the character of *a people* is general, including, in such emergencies, all parties. Murray, therefore, was probably in as much danger as Lennox or Darnley,\* and, indeed, it is now known, that he did fall a victim to

\* It is surprising to me that the short work of *Conæus*, to which we have often referred, should have been so much overlooked, in the controversy respecting the events of this period. The testimony of a Catholic, writing under the Pope's eye, is certainly not to be despised. Now this author, not only tells us, that Darnley had a design to murder Murray, but that Murray being advertised privately of his designs, determined to have him (Darnley) murdered, "*ne perderetur*," that is, lest he himself should be murdered *first*. Darnley, it seems, was turned from his purpose, by the interference of the Queen, which *Conæus* seems to blame her for, "*magno utriusque dispendio*," to the undoing of both; we apprehend the "*ne perderetur*," of *Conæus*, would explain

*assassination*. This proves what the character of the people was, of whom Randolph was writing; but the *assassination* both of Lennox and Darnley, at this critical moment, it has been positively asserted, had the implied, if not direct sanction of Randolph and *Cecil*; for such is the construction put upon a passage in a letter from the former. "The question," says he, "has been asked me, whether if they (Darnley and Lennox) were delivered to us at Berwick we would receive them? I answered, we would receive our own in what sort soever they came in to us."—"That is," exclaim all Mary's advocates, "*dead or alive*." This seems so obvious to them, that it is continually repeated, and even the Reviewers of their works admit the conclusion to be inevitable; but, surely the common soil of Scotland would have afforded them a burial place in case of assassination, without sending their dead bodies to be delivered to Elizabeth's Commissioners at Berwick. The question was, whether if Darnley and Lennox were delivered to the Commissioners at Berwick, they would be received by the English? Yes, said Randolph, we will receive our own in what sort soever *they come in to us*. Could they *come in* as dead corpses? In truth, they had both been recalled as Elizabeth's subjects; they had both refused to obey the call; they had virtually renounced their allegiance to England. Murray and his friends entertained ideas of *arresting* them,† and

many of the dark deeds of the sixteenth century; as the general struggle seems to have been, who should be the *first* victim.—See *Conæus*, 77, 78. This alone, perhaps, may be the true explanation of all Mary's sufferings and death, as we expect to be able to shew; as to the design of Darnley, *Conæus* probably took it from Leslie. Laing thinks it quite destitute of proof, we only advert to it to shew, how very familiar the idea of murder and assassination appears to have been to the writers of those times. "Cette espèce de Vengeance," says M<sup>lle</sup>. Keralio, "n'avoit pas, dans les mœurs de ce temps, tout ce qu'elle presente aujourd' hui de honteux et de lâche," with much more to the same effect. We ought to add, however, that if *Conæus* had any good authority for what he alleges of Darnley, it might help to clear up some doubts still entertained as to this portion of the Scottish History. Dr. McCrie in his *Life of Knox*, vol. ii. p. 193 (note), has given a very good reason for thinking, that the charge against *Murray* for conspiring the death of *Darnley* was not true, since it was never adduced against him in the Queen's proclamations, or the judgments of the Courts of Scotland; though he had charged Darnley with such a conspiracy against his *own* life; and which, indeed, is known to be confirmed by many authors; by some indeed Mary has the credit given her of warning Murray of Darnley's purposes.

† Murray had been instrumental in bringing them back at the instance of Mary, and no sooner had Lennox (who was very little wiser than his son) got into favour with the Queen, than he entered into cabals with the Nobles most hostile to Murray.



sending them back to England, as having stolen away from thence on false pretences. It required, therefore, to be known, if possible, whether they would be received at Berwick under such an arrest. Randolph's was a cautious answer, but we do most confidently believe, that it implied no more, than that whether they *returned voluntarily*, or were *brought back* under *arrest*, they would be received—so much for this most foul but often repeated charge of projected *murder* or *assassination* against Randolph and *Cecil*; we could almost deduce from Murray's question and Randolph's answer, a deliberate purpose of *saving their lives*, if it could be accomplished: we will receive "*our own*," for instance, might be some *security* to them, in reminding those who seemed to be meditating some personal restraint, or worse, that they were still the subjects of Elizabeth. Even Chalmers, Mary's great advocate (and *Cecil's* as great enemy), says, p. 139, that the *question* clearly pointed to the *arrest* of Lennox and his son, for the purpose of being delivered to Elizabeth's officers at Berwick. Randolph's answer then should surely have the same construction put upon it. Castelnau asserts, that, after all, Elizabeth wished the match to take place; see him cited by Robertson, i. 195. and Robertson himself regards it as one so unobjectionable to Elizabeth, upon her own principles, as to lead him to conclude, that all her objections were affected and delusive. But Mary was about to marry Darnley in *defiance* of Elizabeth, in resentment of her procrastination of matters, and to free him from all subjection to her, even before she married him.\* This mode of proceeding had enough in it to break Elizabeth's measures. Mary may be excused for acting in the independent manner she chose to act, but Elizabeth had reason to be angry with the part taken by the Lennoxes; by Robertson's own account, i. 196, *Maitland* seems to have discovered this, and to have exercised his own prudence, to obviate the ill effects of another rash and angry step Mary was inclined to take.

The course of things was bad enough without making them worse by *false* charges and uncalled for *exaggerations*. Mary was undoubtedly about to

\* Robertson thinks Murray was *deceived* by Elizabeth's *pretended* objections, and under this deception, was led to form the design of seizing Darnley and sending him as a prisoner into England, i. 199; but if he be right, in fancying, with Castelnau and others, that the match was not disagreeable to Elizabeth, how are we to account for Randolph's seeming to sanction the *arrest*, if it could have been accomplished. The truth may be as we have shewn, that Elizabeth at all events, objected to the *mode* in which the marriage was about to be concluded. The arrest is said to have been prevented, by Mary's timely removal with Darnley beyond the Forth.

commit herself in a way that might be fatal to the best interests of Scotland ; there was a chance of getting Lennox and his son out of the kingdom before the marriage could take place. Mary knew as little of Darnley's temper and real character as any of her subjects could know—he had given offence to many of the latter, in the most imprudent manner possible, considering his views ; and he had been fostered and encouraged by Mary's equally rash and imprudent minion *Rizzio*, a supposed emissary or agent of the Pope. We cannot enter into every particular of this great Northern disturbance, we are only seeking, in defence of England and her agents, and particularly her great Minister, *Cecil*, to point out such leading and undeniable circumstances of the case, as ought in all justice to be taken into consideration.

All the projects, however, to hinder or delay this fatal marriage were unavailable. The Pope's dispensation was obtained, and the ceremony concluded ; and immediately afterwards (without the consent of the estates of the kingdom) Darnley proclaimed King, though in the case of Francis II., the consent of Parliament had been judged necessary ; and in truth it amounted to a breach of the Constitution.\* Lennox and Darnley escaped all arrest or assassination, and again Mary triumphed over all who would have stood in her way ; and had her choice been more wise than it turned out to be, subsequent historians might have escaped many a dreary, perplexing, and painful labour ; as it is, we must proceed regularly to the catastrophe we set out with, the death of *Rizzio*.

No sooner had Darnley obtained the hand of Mary, and been advanced to kingly rank and honours, than he began to conspire against Murray, without whom, neither himself or his father would have been allowed to return to Scotland ; he exerted his influence with the Queen, to deprive him of her favour, remonstrated strongly against her former attentions to him, in the honours and titles conferred on him, and leagued with those who were his particular enemies, and equally the enemies of the reformed religion, Lennox (his father), Athole, and *Rizzio*. Murray had in fact already alienated the Queen's mind, by declining to put his hand to any approval of the marriage before the Nobility had been consulted ; this seems to have obliterated at once all memory of past services, and afforded a plausible opening for the resentment of Darnley. —*McCrie*, ii. 132. See also *Robertson*, i. 197 ; where the reasons for

\* Randolph, writing of the Proclamation, says, " No man said so much as AMEN, saving his father, who cried out aloud, God save the King."

Murray's declining to give his consent to the marriage are very ably and fairly urged.

Three days after her marriage, Mary summoned Murray again to the Court, and because he did not choose to put himself in the power of a Court so influenced against him, and expose himself to the vengeance of Darnley, he was proclaimed an outlaw.\* While the Queen released Lord Gordon from his confinement, and restored to him the Earldom of Huntley, recalled the Earl of Sutherland, and permitted Bothwell (another great enemy of Murray) to return to Scotland, every thing, in short, conspiring to prove to Murray the inexorable resentment entertained against him. The Lords, who, as well as himself, were dissatisfied with the match and the late proceedings, assembled at Stirling; and after agreeing to request the protection of Elizabeth, retired to their houses.† “But the Queen taking the field with all the forces she could collect, they were at last *compelled* to arm in their *own defence*. Even after they were driven to this extremity, they neglected no means of conciliation; they professed their steadfast loyalty to the Queen; they declared that they desired only that the reformed religion should be secured against the dangers to which it was exposed; and that the administration should be put into the hands of those whom the nation could trust;‡ and they offered to submit their own cause to be tried by the laws of their country. But the Queen spurned all their offers of submission; refused to listen to any intercession in their favour; and advancing against them with her army, herself being in little less than full military array, obliged them to take refuge in England.”§—*McCrie*.

\* See Robertson on the two conspiracies, i. 200.

† The most considerable persons who joined Murray, were the Duke of Chatelherault; the Earls of Argyle, Glencairn, Rothes; Lords Boyd and Ochiltree; the Lairds of Grange, Cunninghamhead, Balconie, Carmylie, Lawers, Bar, Dreghorn, Pitarrow, Comptroller, &c.—*Robertson*, i. 203.

‡ Every thing relating to Mary's character ought to be known in a case like the present. Mad<sup>re</sup>. de Keralio thus speaks of her hasty marriage: “Une passion violente, *jointe aux obstacles opposés à ses desseins*, avoit engagé, cette princesse à *élever Darnley sur le trône*.”

§ Of the reception these and other fugitives from Scotland met with in *England* at this momentous period, we have nothing more to say, than once more to refer to the *cause* they had in hand; a cause which, if England had abandoned, in all probability every blessing for which she had been contending from the days of Henry VIII. (and we may reasonably add, from the very *birth* of *Cecil*), would have been swept away and annihilated; and there is no saying with how great a destruction of persons, from the Queen on her throne to the lowest of her natural and loyal defenders. As to the mummery of making Murray and his associates undergo, as rebels, the



We have copied this passage without scruple, because in the original it is accompanied with proper references, and it comprises a good deal in a small compass. It shews how helpless this party was become in a very short time, and may serve to connect the hasty proceedings of the Queen, with what we shall have to relate of her determination, if possible, to root out Protestantism. At the same time, we must acknowledge it to be a most intricate portion of history, and one which it is almost impossible to clear up, or thoroughly extricate from the contradictory representations and strictures of party writers. We must still refer our readers to the revolutionary struggle on foot throughout Europe, in order to decide upon the measures adopted by the contending parties. We cannot possibly hesitate to praise the Queen for her heroic defence of her own principles, and her own determination in regard to the marriage, but if those opposed to her must be given up as *rebels*, another point remains to be determined; namely, whether they were *traitors* to their *country*. The Queen was in bad hands, the Protestant Church in danger, the ancient liberties of the people threatened, and a great probability raised of the kingdom falling back to Popery and foreign influence, to the exclusion of those most nearly allied to the throne; and of Murray particularly, though illegitimate, but who had, as the Queen's Minister, so carried on the Government since her return to her own dominions, as to render his sister and Sovereign very deservedly popular; but who was now compelled to yield up all authority and interest to a wayward boy, an upstart Italian, a Popish emissary and agent, and to a deluded female, surrounded by his immediate enemies, expressly recalled and honoured to aggravate his fall.—It is wrong, in trying to appreciate the steps taken at this time by the Queen and her foolish husband on one side, and the confederate Lords on the other, to forget the *country*, and the great interests at stake, affecting the happiness, the honour, and the welfare of Scotland.

penance of a royal reproof before the Ambassadors of France and Spain, the great question seems to be, how the latter could be satisfied with the scene that passed? Could Murray, &c. have separated Mary from her ill advisers, their opposition to her authority might have been ended soon, but at all events, if resistance to regal power can be justified, Englishmen, of all people in the world, ought to know that it can only be so when ancient rights and liberties, constitutional privileges, and freedom of thought, are threatened and brought into positive danger. That such was the state of Scotland at this period, we cannot bring ourselves to doubt; Elizabeth had expressed her sentiments to the dissatisfied Nobles in two very able dispatches, July 10, and September 12, 1565, cautioning them against rebellion, while they upheld the cause of Protestantism.—See *Turner's History*, vol. ii. p. 30, 32, *notes*.

The *departure*, however, of Murray and his associates was entirely favourable to the views and purposes of Mary; while her marriage was in doubt, she had tampered with the Reformed ministers, conferred with them, attended their sermons occasionally, and expressed herself desirous of learning the truth at their lips;\* she had induced Darnley, who also went to mass, to be present at some of their sermons; but when the marriage had been concluded, and the Protestant Lords expelled, she lost no time in letting the Commissioners of the Church know that she neither could nor would ever depart from her religion. The King openly professed himself a Catholic, and joined in some of their most superstitious and peculiar ceremonies. Friars were appointed to preach at Holyrood House, and the Reformed ministry had every occasion given them to feel disheartened, if not in absolute danger; their situation appeared so alarming that the General Assembly thought it expedient to enjoin a fast, the reasons for which they required *Knox* to set forth, in a public treatise or admonition to the people; and he executed the task assigned to him with great clearness and precision; he dwelt largely on the decree of the Council of Trent, that all Lutherans, Calvinists, and such as are of the new religion, shall utterly be rooted out; he shewed how the decree had been begun to be put in execution already in France, and how much all were expected to pay homage, as of old, to the Roman idol; opportunity only being wanting for them to finish their work.

As if it had been designed to confirm all that Knox had insisted upon, in the beginning of February, 1566, at a time when Mary was beginning to relent in regard to the exiles, and to be disposed to recall them, on the advice of Sir N. Throckmorton (*in opposition*, it has been said, to *Cecil*,† but why so, we cannot exactly see), a messenger arrived in Scotland from the Cardinal of Lorrain,‡ with a copy of the *Catholic League* for extirpating the Protestants, and instructions to obtain the Queen's subscription to it, and to urge the propriety of adopting the most rigorous measures against the exiled or expelled Nobles.§ Mary, who was, as Robertson has said, deeply tinctured with all the

\* See, as to her earnestness in endeavouring to reconcile her subjects generally to the match, *Robertson*, i. 198. "In no scene of her life," says he, "was ever Mary's own address more remarkably displayed."

† *Robertson*, i. 210.

‡ It was, in fact, the same M. Rambouillet sent to invest the Duke of Norfolk and Leicester with the order of St. Michael, and who had afterwards brought t' e same to Darnley.

§ As we read of nothing so much at this time as the hypocrisy and dissimulation of Elizabeth, it may not be amiss to copy what Mad<sup>le</sup>. de Keralio says, of this mission of M. Rambouillet.

prejudices of Popery, and devoted to her bigoted uncles of Lorrain, whose advice she constantly viewed with a degree of filial respect, scrupled not to set her hand to this exterminating league; and having done so, she began to act upon it by summoning Murray and his associates to appear before the Parliament in March. The Popish Ecclesiastics were restored to their places in Parliament, the Lords of the Articles selected according to the Queen's choice, from among the Papists, and open preparations made for restoring the Catholic worship. Rambouillet, was by no means the only person commissioned to make Mary a party to the proceedings at Bayonne; having often cited Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, as a writer partial to Mary, we shall add what she has written of these French envoys or messengers: "Il étoit prescrit à ces envoyés d'empêcher Marie Stuart de pardonner aux réformés; on l'instruisoit des conférences de Baïonne; on la pressoit de se réunir aux destructeurs de la religion prétendue réformée, et on l'exhortoit à ne pas souffrir dans ses états une religion qu'on alloit anéantir dans toute l'Europe. On employoit pour la séduire tout ce qui pouvoit agir sur l'esprit d'une princesse jeune, foible, et attachée à sa religion. Son ancienne déférence aux conseils de la maison de Lorraine, son respect pour l'archevêque de Glasgow, le desir de se rendre agréable à Dieu, l'orgueil d'avoir contribué à rétablir son culte dans toute son intégrité, le plaisir d'abaisser ses ennemis, tout concourut à imprimer dans son ame *de fatales résolutions*. Les sages avis de Melvil furent oubliés, et ceux de Throgmorton négligés."—Surely these bad friends ought to be numbered amongst Mary's worst enemies. That Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio herself thought so, is plain from the following passage: "Tout sembloit cependant promettre à Marie des jours plus heureux et une réputation glorieuse, lorsque le génie de Catherine de Medicis vint repandre sur cette princesse le *poison de ses conseils* et la *precipiter dans un abîme de maux*."

But by this time the King and Queen had ceased to live upon good terms; and the wayward passions of Darnley had prepared him for some desperate revenge on the minion Rizzio, whom he suspected of interfering to hinder his views of obtaining the matrimonial crown. It may be quite impossible to

"Catherine de Medicis avoit voulu, par un hommage flatteur, *éblouir* la reine d'Angleterre, et *détourner ses regards* du complot formé aux conférences de Bayonne," [where the extirpation of heresy and heretics was fully agreed upon.] "Elisabeth," she proceeds to say, "n'ignoroit pas qu'elle travailloit à la perte des Protestans; mais quel homme pouvoit prévoir l'horrible événement qu'elle méditoit?"



ascertain the precise steps that led to this catastrophe. There can be no doubt that the ill-judging Italian, by too great a boldness and presumption upon all occasions, but especially in the Queen's presence, had disgusted not only the Nobles, but the people; there can be no doubt that his counsels (however friendly to Mary) tended to the overthrow of the Protestant religion, and, to a signal vengeance on the fautors of the new faith. Ruthven, Morton, Lindsey, and Maitland, Murray's former associates, had not stuck by him in his opposition to the marriage, but having many family connexions with the new King, had continued with the Court; till finding their credit declining, and attributing to Rizzio the disgrace and exile of their former leader, Murray, and suspecting that he would be an obstacle to his return, they determined to abridge his power if they could. It is said that they wished to bring him to a regular and public trial,\* but that Darnley's impetuosity, stimulated by insinuations calculated to excite his *jealousy*, hurried matters on, and determined him to have him seized in the Queen's *presence*. (See Keith and Laing). He was *prepared* even, it has been asserted, to strike the fatal blow himself.

The story of his death is so well known, that it need not be enlarged upon in this place. It was altogether perhaps as atrocious an act as could have been perpetrated;† but that the object was to procure Mary's abortion, that no child might be born to the interruption of *Murray's* designs upon the *crown*, is more than we are at all prepared to acknowledge. Lord Ruthven asserted,

\* It is said *cords* were prepared to hang him; and certainly cords there were ready in the palace, as appears from the Queen's letter to Archbishop Beton, and from the escape of Huntley and Bothwell, mentioned below.

† The persons concerned in it were perhaps, according to modern notions, the *last* to be *expected* to embark in *such* an enterprise. Morton, *the Lord High Chancellor of the Kingdom*; Maitland, who had been *Secretary of State*; and Ruthven, who being just recovered from a dangerous illness, and who actually committed the deed (clad in complete armour), needed two men to support him to the palace to commit the murder, on account of his weakness and feeble state of body. Morton and Ruthven fled into England; while Murray and the other banished Lords returned. We are sorry to say, these most unjustifiable measures were judged *necessary* to the upholding of the Protestant cause. Goodall does not see how the death of Rizzio could be connected with this, as insisted upon unwarily by Knox. But if he were a secret agent of the Pope, and had ensured an influence in the approaching Parliament against the Protestant Lords, which the Queen's own letter seems to admit, Knox might be right in thinking that had he lived, and the Parliament taken effect, "the true Protestant religion would have been wrecked, and Popery erected." This is no vindication of the dreadful outrage by which these evils seem to have been averted.

that it was not intended to be done in the Queen's presence. The probability of such consequences ought certainly to have prevented such an outrage\* in such a place; but by whatever means the King's passions had been worked up to such a pitch of frenzy, it seems probable that the haste and indelicacy with which the deed was perpetrated, arose from the King's impatience to seize upon the first good opportunity that presented itself; and especially to surprise the Queen herself in her private amusements, to which, with only a few others, Rizzio was too constantly admitted. The deed was certainly, in its circumstances, as foul and barbarous a deed as could have been committed, whether it were the act of Papists or of Protestants; but we cannot resist noticing one extraordinary attempt to cast the blame exclusively upon the latter, as though it would have been *impossible* for any *Papist*, even in those days, to commit a deed so base and sanguinary. Conræus, whom we have before had occasion to cite, in his *Vita Mariæ Stuartæ*, not contented to represent the act as one most barbarous and ferocious, as every person must acknowledge it to have been who has the least degree of feeling, tells Pope Urban VIII., for whom the book seems to have been written, that it was, in short, *so* base, *so* barbarous, and *so* inhuman, that none but *heretics* (meaning thereby the Reformed party in Scotland) could have committed so atrocious a deed. “*Nusquam nisi apud hæreticos audito facinore.*” Which in fact makes it stronger, as vouching for no similar atrocity having ever been heard of *nisi apud hæreticos*, which in plain terms, as applicable to those days, means except among Protestants. As the very book we transcribe from was published at Rome not very long after Elizabeth's death, and not more than half a century subsequent to the *massacre of St. Bartholomew*, the author probably may have been living at the time of that most murderous destruction, of which we shall have much to say hereafter, not of Catholics by the hands of Heretics, but of *Protestant Heretics* by the hands of Catholics. A deed commended, rejoiced in, and even celebrated with a jubilee by Pope Gregory XIII., one of Urban's predecessors; commemorated also by a medal, that a deed so meritorious might not easily be *forgotten*, having on one side the effigy of the Pope, and on the other the exterminating angel

\* The haste with which the deed was done, was occasioned by the necessity that arose for preventing the sitting of the Parliament; and it is probable, that they expected to find Huntley and Bothwell in the room as well as Rizzio; both of whom were in the palace, and only escaped by letting themselves down by a *cord* from a back window.—*Goodall*.

striking the unhappy Hugonots or Protestants, with this inscription below, or around it—Hugonotorum Strages, 1572.

Every historian, who attempts to unravel the transactions of the sixteenth century, may at every turn expect to meet with records of this description; there is scarcely one contemporary writer that deserves to be trusted; at the very time referred to, of Rizzio's murder, Darnley himself (though the *deed was done by Protestants*, much to their shame) was a *professed Papist*; and it has been alleged by some, as we have shewn, that the murder was more owing to his impatience and impetuous passions,\* than consistent with the original design of the offended Nobles. But we may have done for the present with this disgusting scene. The Protestants ought to bear the blame of it, but not as of a deed of such *unparalleled* wickedness † and cruelty as *Concæus* pretends; who wrote *his* book, as we have already observed, not long *after* the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

We cannot wonder that Mary should be extremely incensed at the indignity offered her, and at the bloody deed executed, as turned out to be the case, in her very presence, and certainly at the hazard of her own life,‡ though that was probably not so much thought of, as some have pretended; but she was now apparently fallen again into the power of those whom she had so much slighted. Several of the Catholic Lords fled from the palace in alarm. Murray immediately returned; and though she would willingly have procured him, if she could, to consent to the punishment of the offenders, yet Murray had been too much connected with them, not to intercede in their favour, and the King had

\* It has been said that he offered to strike the first blow, and it seems to be certain that his dagger was found sticking in the body of the murdered Secretary. But this has been accounted for as the act rather of Douglas; and the probability seems to be, that the King himself was not actually one of the slayers of the unfortunate Rizzio.

† See Robertson's remarks on the frequency of assassinations at this period, book iv. anno 1566; and the surprising coolness with which the very conspirators were afterwards known to speak and to write of "*David's slaughter*."

‡ Mary is said to have threatened Ruthven with the vengeance of all her foreign *friends*, the King of Spain, the Emperor, the French King, the Pope, many Italian Princes, and particularly of her uncles of Lorraine. She is also said to have uttered the following passionate exclamation, "I shall forbear to weep, I shall think of nothing but revenge;" had she said so, who could have blamed her? Never was any woman placed in so cruel a situation; but those who have compared the different accounts extant of this sad murder, seem to us to have very fairly decided that she used no such words.—See the note in the Hist. of M<sup>te</sup>. *Keralio*, who refers to many authors.



clearly implicated himself with them, in the perpetration of the deed ;\* the Queen, however, by good management, soon found herself able to detach Darnley from his new associates, and retiring with him to Dunbar, they were soon joined by *Huntley* and *Bothwell* ; from thence she advanced towards Edinburgh, at the head of eight thousand men, and to separate Murray from the conspirators, promised an ample indemnity to his associates, and received him into favour, while the latter were compelled to pass the frontiers, and take refuge in Newcastle, where Ruthven soon died.† Morton was the greatest sufferer amongst the survivors ; deserted by the King, and apparently by Murray and his party, he was compelled to relinquish his high office, and abandon his great property. But the King, undoubtedly, had so grossly committed himself upon this occasion, as to betray all the weakness of his understanding, the strength of his passions, and the ferocity of his disposition. The Queen wept at the discovery of the folly she had committed in marrying him, and did all she could, by neglect, to lessen and abridge his power.

As the King sank in her esteem, Bothwell rose. The latter seemed to be a complete contrast to the former ; active, wise, and enterprising, he watched his opportunities of assisting Mary, when she stood most in need of help, and managed to lay her under obligations to him, which were rewarded with the strongest marks of her gratitude and bounty.

But the time of Mary's delivery was approaching, and the Council suggested the propriety of her fixing her residence in the strong castle of Edinburgh. The Queen seized upon the occasion, as a fitting opportunity for the reconciliation of the divided Nobles ; and she had the satisfaction of allaying, as she probably flattered herself, all the discords between Murray and Argyle, Huntley and Bothwell. On the 19th of June, 1566, her only son, James, was born, who lived to unite the two crowns of England and Scotland, after a whole century of disturbance and confusion ; but before the event just mentioned came actually to pass, it is but too well known, how many dismal scenes the unfortunate

\* Darnley afterwards pretended to exculpate himself, as quite ignorant of the purposes of the murderers, but how came he not to suspect Ruthven's appearance in complete armour, when he conducted him by a private staircase to the Queen's apartment ? We confess, we cannot feel surprised, that, as Buchanan states, Darnley's proclamation to this effect (on which, however, Goodall seems to rely), was treated with *laughter and derision*.—See *Goodall*, i. 280. 285.

† “ On this, as on former occasions,” says Laing, “ the same vigour, spirit, and resolution, are discernible in her conduct, and she suppressed a conspiracy of the most subtle statesmen, by her consummate prudence, art, and address.”

mother had to go through, and how little comfort she ever derived from the royal infant just born into the world. It is quite necessary to proceed with the history, but we shall endeavour to be brief, and rather give a summary of our own convictions, than dive too deeply into a controversy, the most endless and unsatisfactory, perhaps, that ever arose, to perplex the minds and harass the feelings of mankind. To form as correct a judgment as we could, of transactions, in which the name of the subject of this Memoir appears so often, we have perused book upon book and treatise upon treatise, with little hope of ever reconciling facts, so clearly, as to be able to advance a positive decision, on many points of the inquiry; we can therefore only state the most undisputed, and generally admitted facts, throwing in occasionally such remarks as may appear to be absolutely called for, in explanation at least of many of the measures adopted for the safety of Elizabeth's person, and the security of England; these being, as we most confidently believe, the invariable and constant objects of *Cecil's* administration—a divided administration at the best, but to all appearance most strong when his prudence, wisdom, and foresight, were most attended to, and suffered to have their freest course.

Mary had no sooner become a mother than care was taken to announce the event in due form to Elizabeth, and, as we have the account of the mission from the very person dispatched, it would be wrong not to transcribe his own statement of facts.\*

“All the while I lay within the castle of Edinburgh, praying night and day for her Majesty's good and happy delivery of a fair son. This prayer being granted, I was the first who was thereof advertised by the Lady Boin, in her Majesty's name, to part with diligence the 19th of June, 1566,† betwixt ten and eleven in the morning. By twelve of the clock I took horse, and was that night at Berwick. The fourth day after I was at London; and did first meet with my brother Sir Robert, who, that same night, sent and advertised Secretary Cecil of my arrival, and of the birth of the Prince, desiring him to keep it quiet till my coming to Court, to shew it myself unto her Majesty, who was for the time at Greenwich, where her Majesty was in great mirth, dancing after supper.‡

\* It must be recollected, that though such passages have been cited and transcribed, and perhaps read again and again in other works, they could not well be omitted in a *Life of Cecil*, from the part he bore in all the transactions recorded.

† 1565 in Melvil by mistake.

‡ She had been, not long before, dangerously ill.

But so soon as the Secretary Cecil whispered in her ear the news of the Prince's birth, all her mirth was laid aside for that night; all present marvelled whence proceeded such a change; for the Queen did sit down, putting her hand under her cheek, bursting out to some of her ladies, that the Queen of Scots was mother of a fair son, while she was but a barren stock. The next morning was appointed for me to get audience; at what time my brother and I went by water to Greenwich, and were met by some friends, who told us how sorrowful her Majesty was at my news; but that she had been advised to shew a glad and cheerful countenance: which she did, in her best apparel, saying, that the joyful news of the Queen her sister's delivery of a fair son, which I had sent her by Secretary *Cecil*, had recovered her out of a heavy sickness which she had lyen under for fifteen days. Therefore, she welcomed me with a merry volt, and thanked me for the diligence I had used in hasting to give her that welcome intelligence."

So far may be regarded as the first act of this miserable farce, beginning, however, probably, with a scene from nature—we mean, the mortified feelings of Elizabeth at receiving intelligence of one who might become her heir, with, apparently, an accumulation of titles to the crown she wore, and which, perhaps, she knew better than any about her Court, would never descend to a son of her own; for, of her own private determination not to marry, there can scarcely be any doubt: nothing less, in all likelihood, could have prevented her accepting some of the many proposals made to her, or selecting from her many favourites at home a partner for her bed. What she felt, therefore, upon the first communication made to her by *Cecil*, had, probably, in it more of mortification than envy; at all events, certainly, no real joy, however it might be pretended, to comply with courtly forms.

The next act of the farce is now to follow. "All this she said before I had delivered to her my letter of credence. After that she had read it, I declared how that the Queen had hasted me towards her Majesty, as one whom she knew of all her friends would be most joyful of the glad news of her delivery, albeit dear bought with the peril of her life, she being so handled that she wished she had never been married."

Now we may very well venture to assure ourselves that Mary did never really believe what Melvil told Elizabeth she *did* believe, nor that such were the motives for her dispatching Melvil to the English Court in so great haste. As to her hard labour, and wish that she had never been married, this tell-tale



Minister has been at the pains to explain this himself in the following passage : “ This I said, by the way, to give *her* a little *scar from marriage*; for so *my brother* had counselled me, because sometimes she boasted to marry the Archduke Charles of Austria, when any man pressed her to declare a second person : then I requested her Majesty to be a gossip to the Queen, to which she gladly condescended. Your Majesty, said I, will now have a fair occasion to see the Queen, whereof I have heard your Majesty so oft desirous.\* Whereat she smiled, saying, that she wished her estate and affairs might permit her.” In this again we may look for some truth. Elizabeth might wish to be godmother to the new heir of the Scottish race, whose claims to the succession she seems, from many circumstances, to have privately, and in the secret counsels of her heart, to have approved. That she would have wished to see Mary, we can also believe, if such an interview could have been rendered in any manner safe, prudent, and agreeable to both parties. “ In the meantime,” Melvil continues, “ she promised to send both Honourable Lords and Ladies to supply her room.” And this she was punctual to perform. In the meanwhile the French King and the Duke of Savoy, uncle to Francis II., were also solicited to be sponsors at the christening of the young Prince.

Before we proceed to give an account of the ceremonies of this royal baptism, it seems incumbent on us to notice a circumstance in which the name of Lord Burghley has been made to stand so prominent, that to pass it by might appear as if we were wilfully inattentive to it; we allude to the manœuvres (for such they certainly were) of Ruxby (*Cecil's spy*, as it is usual to this day to call him), in Scotland, and in communication with the Queen herself.

We must begin with observing, that in an age of such subtle intrigue and dark designs, those otherwise hateful agents, *spies*, were, as near as could be, indispensably necessary. There was not, perhaps, during the whole of the sixteenth century, a kingdom, a court, or even a city, that was free from them. They may be said, perhaps, to have had a regular beginning, when the institution of the Jesuits first took place. As the Roman Pontiff, extravagant as his pretensions were in general, could not invade the attributes of the Deity, he had no other means of being omnipresent and omniscient but by availing himself of the eyes and observations of others : he had no other means of penetrating the hidden purposes of man's heart but by the assumption of disguises and concealed approaches. It is

\* This may serve to prove the strangeness of the mistake already noticed in Strype's Annals, where it is said, that in May or June of the year 1565, the two Queens had an interview.

melancholy to have to speak of such things as *necessary*; it is not possible, perhaps, thoroughly to excuse them, under the name of political expediency, but as a defence against threatened but unknown evils, and premeditated, though concealed, mischief, their employment may admit of palliation; especially if it can at all be shewn that there was more in them, with regard to England, of *counterplot* than *plot*. Ruxby, as we have said, is generally spoken of as *Cecil's* spy: our inquiries, therefore, are naturally directed to the ascertaining whether at the same time there were not spies at work in England, watching their opportunities of disturbing the government of that country by their intelligence, quite as much as any thing Ruxby could be contemplating or practising in Scotland. We shall endeavour to relate the case as briefly and plainly as we can, and leave it to the reader to draw his own conclusions.

A writ of execution, for debt, being out against Ruxby in England, he found it prudent to get as soon as possible beyond the borders, and seek shelter in Scotland. On his way thither, he stopped first at the house of Mr. Lassells, his wife's brother, a person friendly to Mary's cause, who conferred with him much on her pedigree and undoubted right to the crown of England, and so sent him forward on his journey, with letters of introduction to Mary, having as he thought brought him over to, or fixed him in her interests; but passing further, he took up his abode with another friend, "a dere frend," he calls him, Sir Henry Percy; he, it seems, "a lytyl musynge of" the part he was about to take, under the advice of Lassells, not only saw the danger he was incurring of becoming a confederate against Elizabeth, but the opportunity that presented itself of his doing the latter, his rightful Sovereign, particular service. That is, in short, by availing himself of Lassell's introduction so far, as to have communication with Mary, and then to inform the English Court of what he might discover of her designs and purposes; a most treacherous and deceitful project undoubtedly, to say the least that can be said of it. So far, however, not *Cecil* but Ruxby's two friends are the most responsible, and the only question touching the Secretary is, whether in an age of such incessant intrigue and underhand doings, he was justified in availing himself of the information Ruxby might pick up, to the better protection and surety of Elizabeth, against the machinations of the Scotch Queen and her friends? The truly watchful Statesman must be excused endeavouring, by almost any means, to penetrate the secret designs of an adverse court, before they become ripe for execution, and we may see from the letters, both of Ruxby and Randolph, in *Haynes*, what

designs were found to be on foot, demanding the immediate attention of *Cecil*, as the known supporter of the crown on the head of Elizabeth. We ought, however, perhaps, to notice first the following passage in the Secretary's letter to Ruxby (or Rooksby), dated from the court at Greenwich, June 16, 1566.

“ Mr. Ruxby, since I understand of your repayre into Scotland, I did much pitie your case, thinking at the first, that Lack and Det had dryven you out of your contre ; but since I have urtherwise heard out of Scotland of your dealing with the Queen ther in other gret matters, I am very sory that you do bestow your time so fondly, lykely to bring yourself into danger ; wherefore of ould acquaintance and frendschippe, I am bold to warne you to staye in good Tym, and not to run hedlong to your own destruction.”—After this caution, he does not certainly refuse his services, in any manner tending to the welfare of Elizabeth, desiring him to communicate with Killegrew, then also in Scotland, or about to be sent thither.\*

Ruxby's letter to Cecil is very long, but some parts of it must be transcribed, in order to shew what was, or might be, passing in England at the same time. After giving the account we have already stated, of his passage into Scotland, and of his interviews with Lassells and Percy, he proceeds as follows (we shall modernise the language):—

“ So I parted from Sir Harry, and came to Edinburgh, where I sent for James Melvyn, and after some talk with him, I gave him a letter from Mr. Lassells to the Queen. And the next evening after ten o'clock was I sent for in a secret manner to speak with the Queen ; and being carried into a little closet in Edinburgh Castle, the Queen came to me ; and so doing the duty belonging to a Prince, I did offer my services, and with courtesy she did receive me, and said, I should be welcome to her, and so began to ask me questions of news from the Court of England, and of the Queen, and of the Lord Robert, with divers other questions. I could say little, for I had not been at the Court a year before. So being very late, the Queen said she would next day confer with me in other causes, and willed me take my ease for that night, and commanded Melvyn see that I were entertained, and to want nothing ; so departed for that time.

“ The next night after, was I sent for again to the Queen, and brought

\* Killegrew had it in commission, by way of getting Ruxby safe out of Scotland, to demand him as an English fugitive—a rebel and a Papist, but Mary was beforehand with him ; having caused him to be seized with all his papers.



secretly to the same place, where the Queen, she sitting down on a little coffer without a cushion, and I kneeling beside, she began to talk of her father, Lassells, and how she was much beholden to him, for he had travelled to get her a true Pedigree of her title to the Crown of England; and how she trusted to find friends in England, *when so ever time did serve*, and did name Mr. Stanley, Harbert, and Darcy, from whom she had received letters; and by means she did make account to win friendship of many of the Nobility; as the Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Derby, Shrewsbury, Northumberland, Westmoreland, Cumberland; she had the better hope of these, for that she thought them all to be of the *old religion*, which she meant to *restore again* with all expedition, and thereby win the hearts of the common people. Besides this, she practised to have two of the worshipfull of every shire of England, and such as were of her religion, to be made her friends, and sought of me to know the names of such as were mete for that purpose: I answered and said, I had little acquaintance in any shire of England, but only Yorkshire; and there was great plenty of papistry.

“She told me she had written a number of letters to Christopher Lassells with blank superscriptions, and he to direct them to such as he thought meet for that purpose. She told me, as she had received friendly letters from divers, naming Sir Thomas Stanley, and one Harbert, and Dacres with the crooked back. Thus meaning, that after she had friended herself in every shire of England with some of the worshipfull or of the best countenance of the country, she meant to cause war be stirred up in Ireland, whereby England might be kept occupied; then she would have an army in readiness, and herself with her army to enter England; and the day she should enter, her title to be read, and she proclaimed Queen; and so certain of every shire to repair unto her for her better assistance, being entered the land to take possession of *her own*; and for the better furniture of this purpose, she had before travelled with *Spain*, with *France*, and with the *Pope* for aid, and had received fair promises with some money from the Pope, and more looked for.

“After she had made me privy to all these purposes, she asked me what I thought of them; and I seemed to like well of them, and shewed myself ready to do any thing that her Grace would direct me. Then said she, I would fain do for the best, for, saith she, the soothsayers tell us that the Queen of England shall not live three years; and now is there good love and favour between our good sister and us; and if we would let our sister be in rest for her time, she will

be content that we shall have it after, and we had rather come to it with quietness than otherwise. What, saith she, think ye best? Madam, said I, the matter is great, take advice of your wise counsel. She answered, that she durst make no more of counsel but my Lord Bodwell, and the Lord Arskyn [Erskine], who had the keeping of Edinburgh Castle, James Melvyn, and myself; and so willed me to confer further of these causes with the Lord Bodwell, whom, I might well perceive, was in more secret favour with her than any other. And thus having won myself into credit, I gave intelligence to Sir Harry Percy: and then Mr. Killegrew came to Edinburgh, with whom I had secret conference. I made him to understand all these practices, and he seemed to be very glad, and willed me to write them all of my own hand, and he would enclose them in his letters to the *Secretary* of England, whereby I might deserve the thanks; and, thereupon I wrote as many things as I had knowledge of: and, as I could find convenient time to get them to Mr. Killegrew, was my chamber searched, and all my writings taken and carried to the Queen, and I brought before the Council, and straitly examined what intelligence I had given to England: I said, none; and confessed I meant to have done, for they had my writings.\* Then would they

\* "What he learned for the time," says Melvil, "I cannot tell; but he did write sundry intelligences unto the Secretary *Cecil*, which did prejudice: but this fine contrivance was not so secretly kept, but my brother *Sir Robert* had knowledge thereof, and also of a letter that the Secretary *Cecil* wrote again unto Scotland to the said Mr. Ruxbie, promising to see him rewarded, and desiring him to continue his diligence; of all which my brother had such good advertisement, that, in due time, he gave her Majesty and me information thereof. The consequence was, he was immediately apprehended with all his writings, and when Killegrew in the name of Elizabeth demanded him to be sent back, not knowing that they had, by apprehending him, got possession of all his secrets, she, with some humour, replied, that to satisfy the Queen her good sister (Elizabeth) she had caused him to be seized, and would give him up as soon as her good sister should please to send for him." Mary was advised to dissemble her knowledge of Ruxby's communications, so that when Melvil visited the English Court, he told both Elizabeth and Cecil that he had been taken up merely on Elizabeth's complaint against him, and, that as Killegrew had insinuated, that she had tampered with O'Niel, he declared that Mary had no dealing with him. "Her Majesty (*i. e.* Elizabeth) seemed," says Melvil, "to be well satisfied with the matters of Ireland, and concerning Mr. Ruxbie, *but she forgot to send for him.*" This is truly a very humorous account of an otherwise grave matter. Elizabeth, perhaps, by this time, knew the truth, through all Melvil's disguises; however, he got a fair chain for his trouble, and returned to Scotland, fully instructed by his brother how to carry on the joke. But we must be contented to refer to the book itself.—See his Memoirs, 141, 2, 3, &c. One thing only must be added, as particularly applicable to the subject we are now upon. The very first article in Sir Robert's instructions to

needs know how I came to the knowledge of such matters, and they being of the Queen's Council, and they not privy to any such thing; they would no way, but I dealt with some familiar; for there was none of them knew that I had any conference with the Queen. Then did they earnestly desire to know whether I had given intelligence of these things to Ireland or no; and I said, no; but I meant to have done, as might appear by my writings which they had. So was I sent to Spayne Castle, with strait charges given to the Captain that no message should either come to me, or go from me; and so I remained a prisoner a year and three quarters."

Such was the purport of Ruxby's account of his proceedings in Scotland. They were treacherous enough, certainly, horribly so for any other times, but the information he obtained is well calculated to shew, that Elizabeth and her great Minister were not the *only practisers* at the time, but that *Mary* had *her* engines at work as covertly in *England*, as any *Elizabeth* could have in *Scotland*: nay, the very next letter, in Haynes's Collection, from Randolph to Cecil, dated June 17th, 1566, and addressed "To Mr. Secretarie selfe, and onlie for himselfe," is a very curious counterpart of the complaints against Ruxby. For, in it he gives Cecil information that much confusion had arisen in Scotland, and much blame had been imputed to him by the Earls of Argyle and Murray, because it appeared that whatever he had written to the Court of late had been divulged, probably by Elizabeth herself to some person who had been careful to communicate it to Mary. "My friends yonder," he says, "complain divers times, that such intelligence as I write from hence out of Scotland (as they think to the Queen's Majesty my Sovereign), are returned back unto *their* Queen, some time by word, some time by writing; they know that this cometh not from *your Honour*, nor from any of those to whom I write commonly of these matters (which only are my Lord of Leicester, my Lord of Bedford, and your Honour), but even from the Queen's Majesty's own mouth, who, at the last time that Mr. *Melvyn* was there, left very little untold unto him of all that at any time I had written." It will be seen that there was some treachery also here, for, though Melvil was an ambassador of Mary's, yet Murray and Argyle thought him too much their

his brother is to this effect: That Ruxby's communications had placed him in so awkward a situation, as a *tamperer* with *Mary's friends* and *Elizabeth's enemies* that he wished the Queen to be persuaded to tell Killegrew that she minded shortly to call him home, for fear lest Elizabeth, discovering his trick, should command him to return. *Cecil's spy*, therefore, was probably of some use as a check upon Melvil, *Mary's* avowed *spy* and practiser.



friend to have communicated what he heard to their disparagement;\* but, besides this, these very Lords informed Randolph that Melvil had written to Mary that he had spoken with *Lassells*, and that he had assured him, for Mary's information, that the Papists were ready to rise in England whenever she would have them : and that she had been assured of the same by others.

Bad and base therefore, as Ruxby's story may appear, *when considered by itself*, it is little to be doubted from the accounts above, that there was as much practising against Elizabeth in England, with Mary's knowledge and connivance, as there could be practising in Scotland against Mary, or rather in favour of the Protestants, and to the defence of England by Elizabeth or her Minister ; and that the most secret communications of Elizabeth, were as much in the way of being divulged and made known to Mary, as Mary's to Elizabeth.

Rapin's account of the state of things in both countries, may now therefore be added, as it is a very just account, and may help to explain what is generally too little considered, that without spies of some description or other, no country in Europe, but especially England, could have been safe for a day. The Pope in his *soldiers* (as the Jesuits have been fitly enough called, and as we shall have frequent occasion to shew), had a large army of such insidious agents, spread over Europe. But to return to Rapin's account of the result of Ruxby's doings in Scotland.

“ Meanwhile Sir Robert Melvil, the Scotch ambassador in England, having found that *Ruxby* was *Cecil's* spy, gave notice of it to the Court of Scotland, who ordered him to be arrested with all his papers, among which were found some of *Cecil's* letters in cipher ; he was kept with such care, that it could not be known why he was apprehended. Shortly after, Elizabeth sending Killegrew into Scotland about some affairs, ordered him to demand Ruxby, as an English fugitive. Mary, *feigning* to be ignorant of *Ruxby's* business in Scotland, replied, she was ready to deliver him to any person, whom the Queen her sister should commission to receive him. But Elizabeth, understanding he had been arrested, and suspecting the reason, said no more of the matter. Thus these two Queens, amidst their mutual demonstrations of sisterly friendship,

\* “ The Scots Ambassador for the time in England,” (says Sir James Melvil his brother,) “ had so good hap, that his credit was great, for he was esteemed sure and *secret* ; which caused a great number of the Nobility, Protestants and Papists, to communicate their *inward* minds and *secretest* intentions unto him, *i. e.* against *Elizabeth*, and in favour of Mary's right to the crown.”—See his own instructions to his brother, just cited.

looked upon one another after all, as real enemies, and not without cause. Mary was privately labouring, by her emissaries, to corrupt Elizabeth's subjects, and inspire them with a spirit of rebellion. Elizabeth, on her part, countenanced the malecontents of Scotland, with secret intimations, that they should always find in her powerful protection."

While Melvil was at London (*i. e.* upon the commission to inform Elizabeth of Mary's delivery), Mary's principal friends thought it absolutely necessary to remove the Court of England's suspicion, occasioned by Ruxby's intelligence; and that, for this purpose, it would be proper for Queen Mary to write two letters; one to her Ambassador in ordinary, to be shewn to Elizabeth, another to Secretary *Cecil*; and draughts were sent to her. These letters were writ accordingly; in that to her Ambassador, Mary protested that she expected nothing but by the favour and friendship of her *good sister*. She enjoined her Ambassador not to hearken to any proposal of the *malecontents* (*i. e.* of England), but threaten to discover their *plots* if they came to his knowledge. The other letter, directed to the Secretary of State, contained the same protestation. *By those letters*, says Melvil, *Ruxby's intelligence was suppressed, and my brother suffered to stay in England, whereby the Queen's friends so increased, that many whole shires were ready to rebel, and their captains already named by the election of the Nobility.*

It is impossible we should think to read this account, without perceiving, that in the course of these dark and covert proceedings, Mary's Ministers evinced quite as much subtlety,\* and displayed as strong a spirit of deception and intrigue, as could in any manner be attributed to *Cecil*, or *Randolph*, or *Ruxby*; and seem to have almost gloried in the success of their insidious operations; but Rapin proceeds, with reference to the last citation from the Memoirs.

"This confession," he says, "of a man who probably was well informed, since he was brother of the Ambassador in ordinary, shews what were *Mary's* designs. Can it be thought, that the Ambassador undertook to incite the Nobles and counties to *rebel*, *contrary* to the *will* of the *Queen his mistress*, or *without her knowledge*? There are in Melvil's Memoirs several passages to the like effect, which shew that Mary and her friends were perpetually striving to take arms

\* "Robert Melvil," says Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, "avoit ménagé les intérêts de sa Souveraine avec tant d'*art*, de zèle et de l'*intelligence*, qu'*Elisabeth* venoit d'*eprouver* combien ses sujets catholiques et *Protestans* étoient déterminés en faveur de sa rivale."

against Elizabeth, when it should be deemed proper. It was therefore no wonder, if Mary refused to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh. That ratification would have *discouraged her friends* in England and other countries. Elizabeth was not ignorant of Mary's aim, which in short was to dethrone her if she could possibly find means. This was the reason of her pressing her so earnestly to take the false step of ratifying the Treaty of Edinburgh, in order to break her measures. On the other hand, at the very time, Mary was making protestations of friendship to her good sister, and entreating her to stand godmother to her son, she was endeavouring to insnare her, by persuading her to get her declared heir to the crown. She knew could she once obtain *that advantage*, her party, which was already very great in England, would become more numerous and powerful. But they both knew their interests too well, to fall into the snares they laid for each other. So Mary never ratified the Treaty of Edinburgh, neither did Elizabeth ever declare *her* her next heir."

This is an excellent account of things, and, having been written before the controversy began, which in the course of the last half century has occupied so many pens, we are the more disposed to trust to it,\* especially as the author goes on to say, what we are as much disposed to regard as the very truth itself; "It may, however, be justly presumed, that if Mary had not lost herself another way, she would have thrown Elizabeth into difficulties, which with all her policy, she would hardly have got clear of."

We are so much persuaded, that Mary had great advantages over Elizabeth,† till she fell by her own great imprudence, that we have copied the above passage the more particularly, as it seems to afford a clue to many of the dismal scenes that ensued, and of which we shall have to give an account.

\* By the writers to whom we refer, Rapin is, of course, branded as an *enemy* to Mary. We doubt not but that we shall incur the same stigma amongst the majority of our readers, for who can take the part of *Elizabeth* or *Cecil*, in this deep tragedy, without giving offence to all *unreflecting sentimentalists*? But reflection, and the most attentive consideration, are forced upon us, by the subject of our inquiries.

† Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, speaking of Elizabeth, 1564, says, "Rivale de Marie, elle ne pouvoit être que rivale heureuse. La puissance et le genie l'emportoient sur les charmes et les talens : Marie étoit abandonnée ; Elizabeth recevoit des Ambassades," &c.—Now, why was Mary abandoned? only, because Elizabeth's foreign *enemies* were jealous of each other, else she might have obtained a balance on her side, of *power*, as well as of *charms* and *talents*. But Austria would not let France have her, nor France let Austria have her, nor Spain let either of them have her, though they all sought her with views inimical to Elizabeth and England.



We have constantly said, that the story of Mary Queen of Scots, properly begins in the reign of Henry VIII., when *Cecil* himself was very young, Elizabeth a child, and Mary an infant. Young, however, as the former was, he was precisely in the way to mark the beginning of things, and personally concerned in what passed as soon as ever Henry was dead. From that moment, Mary was made a blind for all sorts of sinister practices against England, Scotland, and Protestantism in both kingdoms, by *France*, the *Pope*, and every bigoted Catholic in Europe. This was not her fault but her misfortune; the latter she could not help, but the former, as far as we can judge, not only might, but should have been avoided. And at how very remarkable a period did she go astray? the instant almost that she had given birth to a Prince, in whom the hopes of the *whole island* of *Britain* might be judged to centre, and in whom, therefore, both kingdoms could not fail to take an immediate interest. The Prince was born in June, in August the Earl of Bedford informed *Cecil* that Bothwell was taken into such favour, as to have become as insolent and presuming as Rizzio, though generally hated.

We must again trespass on the author just cited, as his account is as correct, and apparently as impartial as any that could be given; more especially as he gives us his opinion of the comparative *credit* of three writers of great name, but doubtful reputation, as contemporary historians; Buchanan, Melvil, and Camden.

“The Prince’s baptism being to be celebrated at Stirling, the Ambassadors of France, England, and Savoy, who were to stand godfathers, repaired thither, and the Court was very numerous. It was the Earl of Bedford whom Elizabeth sent to stand in her place. The Prince was named JAMES, and the Queen prevailed, though with much difficulty, that he should be baptized after the manner of the Romish Church, intending to educate him in the Catholic religion. While the Court was at Stirling, the King was exposed to unheard-of indignities, not daring to shew himself, by reason of the extreme want he was reduced to; while Bothwell appeared with a royal magnificence, to the great scandal of the Queen. But not insisting upon what *Buchanan* says, since he is not thought impartial, I shall content myself with the testimony of *Melvil*; the Queen, says that author, being at Stirling, seemed very melancholy, and complained to me of Rizzio’s murder, as an outrage that could not be blotted out of her mind. I endeavoured to comfort her, and to persuade her to recall the banished Lords, that she might enjoy a peaceable Government. I had now somewhat prevailed with her, but alas! she had bad company about her; for

the Earl of *Bothwell*, who had a mark of his own that he shot at, as soon as he understood of her wise and merciful deliberations, took occasion to bring in the Earl of Morton and his associates, thereby to make them friends, and by them to fortify his faction ; for, apparently, he had already in his head, the resolution of performing the foul murder of the King, which he afterwards put in execution, that he might marry the Queen ;” he adds further, that the Earl of Bedford, \* being upon the point of returning to England, † desired him to tell the Queen from him, that for her own honour she should entertain the King as she had done at the beginning ; *Melvil* discharged his commission, but without any effect. ‡ What *Buchanan* relates, the author concludes is much better confirmed by these testimonies, than confuted by *Camden’s* silence.

We shall endeavour to step cautiously, and therefore securely, through this distressing part of our narrative ; being very sensible of the stumbling-blocks in our road, and the difficulty of going right amidst a host of guides, some true, perhaps, but many exceedingly false. We write, we most willingly acknowledge, under a constant impression that Mary never ceased to be a most *dangerous* rival to Queen Elizabeth, not merely in herself, or from any innate

\* Francis Russel, second Earl of Bedford. Camden speaks of him, as “ a true follower of religion and virtue ;” he died in the year 1585. Sir Robert Melvil had instructed his brother, Sir James, to procure Mary to ask to have *Leicester* and *Cecil* sent by Elizabeth ; it does not appear that any such step was taken ; or if it had been, what were Sir Robert Melvil’s precise views. We shall see, hereafter, that they were invited to be at Paris, just previous to the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

† We have not judged it necessary, to notice very particularly the commission with which the Earl of Bedford was further charged, to urge afresh the ratification of the Treaty of Edinburgh, because both Queens appear to have been long before brought to the point, from which neither would by any means be induced to recede or depart ; by the declaring of Mary heir to the English throne, as she desired, Elizabeth must have known that all the Catholic friends of the former would derive encouragement and hope, inimical to her own repose and the peace of the kingdom. She went, therefore, as far as she could well go, by the stipulation, that she would do nothing to invalidate Mary’s claims after her own demise. And Mary, perhaps, went as far as she could go with prudence, in stipulating to forego the claim, title, &c., during Elizabeth’s life. But the matter, as we shall see, was about to be taken up by Parliament, in an unexpected manner.

‡ Camden says, Bedford was *expressly commanded* not to give Darnley the title of King, and yet proceeds to add, that *according to his instructions*, he dealt with the Queen to have the jarrings between her and her *husband* compounded ; but the latter proceeding must have appeared to be a virtual acknowledgment of the *title*, which, as *her husband*, Darnley bore, and after all, the injunction not to give him the title of King does not appear in Bedford’s instructions.—*Laing*, i. 22.

original malignity of heart, but from what she could not avoid ; her near relationship to the father of Elizabeth, and therefore to the crown ; her early introduction into the French Court ; her powerful, ambitious, and bigoted foreign connexions ; the prejudices of a foreign education, and her rooted attachment to the Romish faith. These things threw her, from the very beginning of her wearisome life, into the hands of the worst foes England could have, during the struggles of the sixteenth century ; and when England, after two reigns of successful contest with the see of Rome, had appeared to be recovered by it under her last Sovereign, and to have been brought back to its pristine obedience to the Pope, its relapse on Elizabeth's accession, could not fail to awaken afresh all the angry passions of the Romanists in general ; to set in motion all the engines of resentment and intolerance the Pope had at his command, and to point out Elizabeth as the grand object of their attacks, from the first day of her reign to the last. Unhappily for Mary she stood in the situation, according to the sentiments of the Catholics, of a *legitimate opponent* ; as an individual that might constantly be set up against Elizabeth, as the only proper competitor, in short, for the crown she wore ; and as one ready to take it up, if it could but be made to fall from the head on which the Parliament and people of England had proudly placed it. Mary could not help these things, nor yet could Elizabeth ; they were a trouble to each other, from the circumstances in which they were placed by the inevitable accidents (if we may use such a word) of their birth and parentage ; both therefore deserve, in some degree, to be pitied, for having been brought upon the public stage of human life, in such direct opposition to each other, that till one of the two should actually fall, the contest could not be terminated ; each being supported by a party, resolved not to retire from the field, or yield the victory, as long as their respective combatants could be kept alive. This we conceive, is the proper view that should be taken of the contest between the rival Queens, and that those who would fritter it down to a paltry competition of merely personal jealousies, are transcendantly mistaken ; the advocates of Mary betraying their ignorance of the real historical bearings of the case, when they rail so unmercifully at Elizabeth ; the advocates of Elizabeth being equally wrong, when they attribute Mary's fall, more to the imputations on her character, than to her political intrigues. Facts are the only things we should look to, as far as they can possibly be ascertained, amidst abundance of contradictions.

At the time of the royal baptism, then, it seems undoubted, that Mary and



her weak husband, were upon terms as far as possible from friendly;\* so much so as to engage the attention of both the English and French ambassadors. The Earl of Bedford urged Melvil to interpose, to reconcile them; and Castelnau, the French Minister, is known to have interposed himself, to put

\* We have not entered into the particulars of what passed at Jedburgh, in the month of October: Bothwell's wound; the Queen's extraordinary visit to him at the Hermitage; and her dangerous illness afterwards; when the King visited her, but was so ill received as speedily to take his departure again. Mr. Turner has so lately, in his history of the reign of Elizabeth, given such a lively and circumstantial account of all that passed on that memorable occasion, that we cannot do better than refer the reader at once to his statement of particulars; vol. ii. ch. xxii. There also the reader may find a very curious and elaborate account of the proceedings at Craigmillar previous to the baptism; proceedings which affect the character of Mary more perhaps than any other incidents preceding the death of Darnley; and of which we shall have occasion to speak hereafter; Mr. Turner's conclusions on several points seem to us irresistible. Had we seen his work before we had proceeded thus far in our present undertaking, we should have felt more confidence in our own conclusions, which had been formed and actually committed to paper, as we could easily prove, before the publication of that portion of Mr. T.'s *Modern History of England*.

We were surprised to find it stated in *Madlle. de Keralio's History of Elizabeth*, that the Queen had been informed that Bothwell was actually dead when she took the journey to the Hermitage, and that she went in consequence of this, personally to take charge of the borders.—But upon many other points relating to this memorable journey to Jedburgh, the author referred to appears to us to have been under a great delusion, and to have exposed herself to the most palpable contradictions. Mr. Turner is much more correct, and better supported by his references to contemporary documents.—One point we cannot help noticing; in order to prove that Darnley was regardless of the Queen's severe illness at Jedburgh, the Bishop of Ross's letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow is cited; in which it is said, "Pendant tout ce temps, le roi est resté à Glasgow, et n' est parvenu visiter la reine." This letter was sent away on the 27th of October, and on the 28th the King arrived; the French Ambassador not knowing, as he wrote to France at the very time, whether he had ever been sent to, or even informed of the Queen's illness, a case sadly misrepresented by Tytler. [See vol. ii. 64.] But at all events, the very letter of the Bishop so often cited, proves as clearly as any thing could be proved, that the Queen was for leaving the care of her child to any body sooner than its own father; which should help to confirm what *Knor* and *Buchanan* have said of his *ill reception* at Jedburgh, when he *did* arrive; for that he did come at last is most true: and indeed she *had* so expressed herself to Maitland, during her illness, as to lead him to tell her Ambassador at Paris, that "it is ane heart-break for her to think that he should be her husband, and how to be free of him she sees no out-gait." The Bishop's letter is printed by *Madlle. de Keralio* from the original in the Scots' College at Paris, and Maitland's may be seen in *Laing*. Chalmers says, the King never came to Jedburgh; but the French Ambassador, Le Croc, saw him there, and had a great deal of conversation with him, though he stayed but one night.

things upon a different footing, if possible ; and with some temporary effect it is said, but of such very short duration, as scarcely to deserve mentioning. Mary was, probably, a woman of too great discernment and too much sense, not to be sorely disappointed, on discovery of the intellectual weakness of her too young husband ; and it must be admitted, that the unfeeling manner in which he had allowed the murder of Rizzio to be perpetrated, could not be easily obliterated from her mind. Still, she had apparently forgiven him ; and had she been disposed to ratify or confirm the friendship which had been thus restored, the birth and baptism of their child, would surely have presented occasions for a reconciliation, without the uncalled-for, and almost provoked interposition of foreigners and strangers. Had Darnley been by any necessity absent, the case might have been different, but he was upon the spot, to suffer the mortification of being excluded, or at the utmost not so welcomed, as the father of a first-born royal infant might expect, under almost any circumstances.\*

And yet there is another fact, which we think stands, after every effort made to soften it down, uncontradicted. We mean, of course, the particular favour shewn to Bothwell at this very time,† the ascendancy he seemed to be gaining over her mind and affections, though married to another woman, and the confidence with which he seemed to be treated, upon all occasions public or private, though his general character appeared to give him few or no claims to so distinguishing a preference, nay, quite the contrary ; still we may allow him the credit of such superior abilities, when compared with Darnley, as very naturally to aggravate the mortification of Mary, when she reflected on the bad choice she had made, and we may conclude that his manners were so insinuating, as to be calculated to make an impression on a mind like Mary's.‡ She

\* We are far from wishing to extenuate any of Darnley's real and gross faults ; but as Buchanan has been blamed for some stories he has related of Mary's power over Darnley, as though she could at all control him, or ever attempted to do so ; this instance of his exclusion from the baptismal ceremony, seems certainly to prove the contrary.

† Bothwell was absolutely appointed to receive the Ambassadors sent to the christening, though the King was there, at which the Nobility are said to have been offended.—See *Sir John Forster's Letter to Cecil*, Dec. 11, in Robertson's Appendix.

‡ Talents and manners would appear to be the only recommendatory qualities he could possess to captivate the Queen, if the accounts given of him by Brantome and the Earl of Bedford be correct. The former having pronounced him to be the *ugliest* man he ever saw, and the latter the *naughtiest*, not exempt from the most detestable vices ; but if we would see his character at length, it may be found in the following extract from the work of Mad<sup>lle</sup>. Kerallio :

was at this time, as Robertson allows, “young, gay, and affable, possessed of a great sensibility of temper, and capable of the utmost tenderness of affections.” How many unhappy females of this very character and description, have become the prey of artful and designing men. Had she not been a Queen, the false steps she was induced to take at this period, would, perhaps, have been long before this buried in oblivion, or remembered only, as one of the many sad instances that have occurred in all ages of unprincipled seduction and female ruin.\* But Mary should surely have felt that she stood too high, and was too conspicuously placed in the world, we will not say to fall with any dignity (for her fall is still disputed), but even to stoop so low, as to *afford ground* for the *imputations* to which she subjected herself, and which, at all events, can never now be cleared away.

But we must hasten to bring this sad story down to the conclusion of the year 1566. It could not be expected that any temper should have very patiently borne the mortifications to which Darnley was subjected by Mary’s resentment, or what must have been worse to most minds, her marked indiffer-

“Une politesse excessive dans les manieres le rendoit capable de plaire, et il joignit à ses vices la plus adroite perfidie; insensible à la gloire, incapable de patriotisme et d’affaires sérieuses, corrompu et plein d’audace, prodigue sans mœurs, effréné dans sa vie publique et privée, une longue habitude avoit fortifié ses inclinations dépravées: il ne connoissoit plus ni honneur, ni probité, ni religion, superbe dans la prospérité, bas dans l’infortune, mais incapable de prévoir les conséquences de ses actions et de songer à l’avenir, il préparoit froidement, le fer, le poison, les embûches, pour commettre un crime, mais il ne pouvoit s’en assurer le fruit.” She is very severe at the same time upon Murray, and we do not feel ourselves obliged to vindicate his personal character, while we defend the cause in which he happened to be engaged, though we fully agree with those who think he has not had fair play given him, and that he may be numbered among the many victims of party spite and malice.

\* Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, we are sorry to say, notwithstanding the horrid character she had given of Bothwell, *seems* to regard his attentions to Mary, in too favourable a point of view. “Il redoubloit ses soins auprès d’elle; il n’oubloit rien de ce qui pouvoit lui plaire et charmer sa douleur; il sembloit ne voir et ne connoître qu’elle dans le monde; le moindre desir de Marie étoit pour lui une loi suprême, il cherchoit à la consoler, il aigrissoit son courroux contre un mari qui disoit-il auroit du trouver en elle toute sa félicité; il tentoit tous les moyens d’éteindre ses regrets en lui inspirant une nouvelle passion.” This is certainly too highly coloured for the credit of Mary, such attentions from a married man should have alarmed her pride; but Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio still draws a conclusion favourable to Mary, which, however, seems to be contradicted by undeniable facts. We allude to the proceedings at Craigmillar, of which Mr. Turner has, in our opinion, given but too correct an account.



ence at such a very particular moment; his conduct on the occasion has been stigmatized as wayward and capricious. We confess we wonder so weak a man should have acted so wisely, for feeling himself degraded in the sight of the whole Court, he determined to go abroad, nor return till the Queen should be disposed to look upon him more favourably, nor could any remonstrances of the Queen or Council, at the moment, divert him from these purposes; so that his father, being to all appearance under as great a cloud as himself, or at the least as much dissatisfied with the proceedings at Court, he resolved to join him at Glasgow, preparatory to his putting his design in execution. He had, indeed, made some efforts to prepare for a friendly reception amongst the strangers he was about to visit, by transmitting a statement of his case to the Pope, and to the Kings of France and Spain;\* but his complaints to the Queen are of the most importance, as exhibiting his own motives for leaving the country. In a letter addressed to her, he assigned the two following reasons for the course he was about to take: "She herself," he said, "no longer admitted him into any confidence, and had deprived him of all power; and the Nobles, after her example, treated him with open neglect, so that he appeared in every place without the dignity and splendour of a King."†

These reasons, as far as they went, were plausible enough. He could not be expected with any comfort to remain where he was; it was giving Mary a chance of placing things upon a different footing, if she had chosen it: his father, Lord Lennox, though displeased at what had taken place, was no encourager of his foreign expedition. The English and French Ministers, sponsors by representation to the new-born infant, had endeavoured to restore peace; the Council had interfered, but without effect upon Darnley. If we look to the complaints of the latter, and consider his age, surely they were not remediless: the Queen might have re-admitted him to her confidence, and restored to him some degree of power, at the least; but we do not find that any such overtures were made on her part. She was careful to send abroad counter-statements to Darnley's representations, to the several Courts of France, and Spain, and Rome; but she does not appear to have entered, with any sort of cordiality, into any measures of

\* These letters were probably the occasion of Mary's causing letters also to be written to the King and Queen Mother of France, and to the Cardinal of Lorraine, "containing a Discourse of the Proceedings betwixt the King and her."—See Secretary Lethington's letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, from Jedburgh, Oct. 24, 1566, in *Laing's Appendix*, 72.

† Robertson.

reconciliation, until her visit to Glasgow, and her plan of removal, which terminated in his death. Maitland and others had proposed to her the measure of *divorce*;\* but this would not exactly do, as Robertson wisely enough suggests; this might have affected her son and the English succession, and yet some divorce probably was necessary, to further all the purposes of Bothwell. We do not feel ourselves obliged, in any manner, to *decide* upon the charges against Mary; but knowing the imputations cast upon her conduct, we have no sort of hesitation to say, that if she were innocent, she ought to have been more guarded against appearances. She was notoriously upon bad terms with Darnley, whilst she encouraged Bothwell, to the surprise and *offence* of many about her Court. Darnley took his leave of her (not for ever, but for a long time), and departed from her presence to Glasgow, having a ship in waiting to convey him beyond sea.

We shall not stop to discuss the question whether he were poisoned before his departure for Glasgow; it has been asserted, as every body knows, but it may be well left out of the history we have to relate, as a matter quite inconclusive, and not much affecting the issue of things. It is most certain that he had a severe illness after his arrival at Glasgow, and which indeed first seized him on his journey thither, so as to excite great suspicions of poison; but we have no occasion to insist upon this one way or the other, and having brought him to Glasgow, there we shall leave him, as far at least as regards the year 1566, with all other transactions relating to Scotland, and proceed to other things.

During the year 1566, the Low Countries were thrown into a state of great alarm and agitation, by the arbitrary and unconstitutional proceedings of Philip and his representatives. The Reformation was making great progress among the people, and Philip was earnestly bent upon putting it down, by the most obnoxious instruments he could possibly introduce into a country constitutionally protected by laws and institutions, which Philip was as much as any person bound to respect, and which could not be violated without alarming the prejudices, and awakening the resentment of a people proud of their privileges, industrious, enterprising and opulent, and who were not destitute of valiant leaders and defenders, if driven to extremities. Charles V. by conciliatory

\* We must again refer to Mr. Turner's able examination of the proceedings at Craigmillar. The reader must be left to judge for himself how far the actual death of the King was at this time contemplated; and if so, who particularly, of the several persons (the Queen included) engaged in the conference, were accessory to the design.

manners, and a real respect for his Flemish subjects (though he had several times given alarm to the popular assemblies), had in many instances wisely promoted their best interests; but Philip disdained the freedom and simplicity of the Flemish manners; his pride would not allow him to cultivate the esteem of his Low Country subjects by any personal condescensions; and the more servile obedience of the Spaniards gave them a preference in his eyes, calculated at all times to excite the jealousy of the former. In the year 1559, his connexion with England being suddenly broken by the demise of Mary, Philip had quitted the Provinces to reside in Spain, with such projects in his head for the future government, or rather subjugation, of his Flemish subjects while personally absent, as could not fail to occasion the greatest heart-burnings and discontent. He had left the government in the hands of his natural sister, the Duchess of Parma, who was to be guided by the counsels of the Cardinal de *Granvelle*, a Minister specially recommended to his son by Charles V. at the period of his abdication—a man of singular talents natural and acquired, highly qualified for public business of all description, but of a temper and disposition the most despotic and tyrannical that could be conceived, in all matters affecting his religion; so that in him the Protestants of all countries were sure to find a bitter enemy.\* The extirpation or subjection of the Reformists, under the name of *Heretics*, was now known to be a settled principle with the Catholics; and Philip seemed to be prepared to rely upon that odious tribunal, a Court of Inquisition, as an almost infallible instrument to accomplish his

\* The following account of this unpopular Churchman and Minister is taken from Le Clerc's *Histoire des Pays-Bas*, tom. i. p. 5: "Il étoit fils de Nicolas Perrenot; d'abord Maréchal à Nozeroy en Bourgoyne, et ensuite procureur à Dol. La Duchesse de Parme l'ayant pris à son service en qualité de Secrétaire, Charles-quintr lui trouva de l'esprit et de la capacité; il se l'attacha, et, selon toute apparence, Perrenot ne négligea pas le soin de sa fortune, puisqu'il acheta la terre et seigneurie de Granvelle, et obtint pour son fils l'évêché d'Arras. Philippe II. à la recommandation de Charles-quintr, employa Antoine Perrenot, évêque d'Arras, dans quelques affaires secrètes; et ce prelat, souple, flatteur auprès de son maître, mais violent et ambitieux, travailla sans relâche au progrès du despotisme, afin de se conserver la faveur du Roi. Son credit lui fit oublier la bassesse de sa naissance; il offensa la noblesse, vexa les citoyens, et devint l'horreur du peuple." He was nominated to the see of Arras at the early age of twenty-five; became afterwards Archbishop of Malines, Primate of the Low Countries, and Cardinal, through the influence of the Duchess of Parma. He was a prodigious linguist, and is said to have been able to dictate to five Secretaries at a time letters in as many languages. He knew seven in all. The *Dictionnaire Historique* gives him credit for many virtues, not however without this essential draw-back, "*mais cruel par zèle.*"



purposes. He knew the force and power it had obtained in Spain,\* and he looked to the establishment of it in all the countries dependent upon him, but especially in the Milanese, in Naples, and in the Netherlands; he was disappointed however in all his purposes. The Milanese and the Neapolitans successfully resisted the attempt, but more quietly than proved to be the case with the Flemings. The latter were stimulated by the love of liberty, and a sacred regard for the institutions of their country, to defy the authority whereby they were about to be oppressed. Having in vain demanded of the Court a meeting of the States, to deliberate on the unsettled state of the country, and the dangers that appeared to threaten them, the Prince of Orange, the Count of Egmont, Count Horn, and several other Lords, withdrew from the Council of State, and agreed to address the King to remove the Cardinal de Granvelle, as a person highly obnoxious to the people; and so odious, that the worst was to be feared if he continued any longer in the Netherlands. Granvelle, upon a hint received from the King, and to avoid the disgrace of a regular dismissal or recall, voluntarily withdrew; and as soon as he was gone, the great men resumed their places in the Council.

A general suspicion seemed to prevail, that the King was bent upon establishing an arbitrary authority among them, in defiance of all their charters of liberty; that he was prepared to crush them by the rigorous, terrific, and dark proceedings of a Spanish Inquisition; that he was about to abolish the meetings of the States General, to enforce the decrees of the Council of Trent, to extirpate the Protestants who had now become very numerous, and to lessen the interest of the great men who might be expected to oppose or resist his designs; and in this state things seem to have stood at the close of the year 1566.

\* Philip's grand principle was to govern the Holy See by paying the most profound respect to it, and to exterminate the Protestants in all parts. At that time there were very few in Spain. Philip solemnly vowed to destroy them all, and he fulfilled his vow. The Inquisition supported him extremely well. All those who were suspected at Valladolid, were burnt by a slow fire; while Philip from his palace window beheld their tortures and heard their cries. The Archbishop of Toledo and Father Constantine Pontius, preacher and confessor to his father, Charles V., were imprisoned in the Holy Office, and the latter burnt in effigy after his decease.—*Voltaire*.

Philip (the same author continues), hearing that there were some Heretics in Piedmont, bordering on the Milanese, sent his orders to the Governor in these three words, *HANG THEM ALL*. And in Calabria, having directed half of such as were convicted to be hanged, and the other half to be burnt, his orders were punctually executed.

As the Queen in the year 1564 had honoured the University of Cambridge with a visit, in the summer of this year, 1566, she conferred the same distinction on the sister University of Oxford, where the Earl of Leicester was Chancellor.

As the account of this visit, in Nichols's entertaining work of Queen Elizabeth's Progresses, commences with a reference to Lord Burghley's Notes (or Diary, as it is often called), we cannot do better than copy the entries selected by the editor, though not all relating to the visits to the University, but as appertaining to the summer of 1566.

"1566.—June. Fulsharst, a fool, was suborned to preach slanderously of me, at Greenwich, to the Queen's Majesty; for which he was committed to Bridewell.

"—— 16. a Discord inter Com :\* Sussex and Leicester, at Greenwich, there appeased by her Majesty.

"—— 21. Accord between the Erle Sussex and Leicester, afore her Majesty at Greenwich.

"August 3. The Queen's Majesty was at Collyweston, in Northamptonshire."

This seat and manor of Collyweston had descended to the crown in 1521, on the attainder of Edward, Earl of Stafford, third Duke of Buckingham; and in 1523, David Cecil, grandfather of Lord Burghley (then only two years old), was by Henry VIII. appointed steward of the Manor.† The house had been almost rebuilt by the Lady Margaret, the King's mother. Prints of the place are to be seen in Peck's *Disiderata Curiosa*, Watts's *Views*, and in the *Virtuosi's Museum*.

"August 5. The Queen's Majesty was at my House at Stamford, at the Grey Friars."‡

Her Majesty upon this occasion, would probably have gone to Burghley (or Burley as it is written), but the younger daughter of the Secretary, Anne, afterwards Countess of Oxford, happened to be suddenly taken ill there of the small-pox.

"Aug. 31. The Queen in progress, went from Woodstock to Oxford."

This visit, it seems, was to have taken place earlier, but for some apprehensions entertained of the plague being in the town.

\* *i. e.* between the Earls of Sussex and Leicester; a difference and rivalry rendered very memorable by the writings, not merely of historians, but of novelists. † See vol. i.

‡ In 1565, the Queen had passed through Stamford, in her progress to Lincolnshire, and dined at the White-Friars, which fell to the ground just after she had quitted it.

Two days before her Majesty's entrance into Oxford, Sir William went thither to see every thing made ready for her reception, in company with the Lord Leicester (Chancellor), the Marquess of Northampton, Lord Strange, Lord Sheffield, Lord Paget, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, and others. The Vice Chancellor and Heads of Colleges went out to meet them, and escort them to Christ Church, where the other Members of the University were appointed to receive them in the open quadrangle, but a heavy rain taking place prevented this part of the ceremony. Two of the Members of the College, however, delivered speeches on their arrival; the one addressed to Lord Leicester, as Chancellor, the other to Sir William; both which being ended, the Secretary, as the account states, after he had talked with Mr. John Pottes,\* of the cause why Aristotle in his *Poetics* wrote de *Monarchia*, there being, as he said, at that time, no monarch in the world; entered into further talk concerning the privileges of the University of Oxford; and then forthwith they went to dinner. After dinner, three Bachelors of Christ Church, were called in, to dispute upon the following question, "then presently," as it is said, "proposed by Mr. *Secretary*."

"An divitiæ plus conferant ad doctrinam persequendam quam Paupertas?"

This disputation ended, the company appear to have returned to the Queen at Woodstock.

It was on the evening of the 31st of August, that her Majesty entered Oxford, being met at Wolvercot, as the utmost limits of the University, by the Earl of Leicester, and other distinguished persons, in their full academical habits,† where receiving the staves of the Beadles, at the hands of the Chancellor, she returned them again, as at Cambridge, and having heard a speech spoken by the Provost of Oriel, late orator, she proceeded on her way, and being arrived within half a mile of the city, was met by the Mayor and Corporation, the former delivering up his mace, according to custom, and upon receiving it again, ad-

\* Of Merton College, "insignis Philosophus, et Medicus satis peritus."—*Athen. Oxon.* He seems to have been brother to Thomas Pottes of Christ Church, who had spoken the oration addressed to Lord Leicester.

† Humphrey, President of Magdalen College, being one who attended in his robes, and having been very earnest as a Puritan against the habits, when he came to kiss the Queen's hand, she said to him, smiling, "Mr. Doctor, that loose gown becomes you mighty well, I wonder your notions should be so narrow."—*Life of Leicester.* She was complimented by the University for having conferred the Divinity chair on Dr. Humphrey, a worthy disciple, and therefore a worthy successor of Peter Martyr. This has been adduced as a proof of the regard paid by the University of Oxford at that time, to the Calvinistic Divines.—*Ib.* p. 42.



dressing her Majesty in an English speech ; presenting at the same time a cup of silver, double-gilt, having in it about 40*l.* of old gold.\*

The Queen entered the city in a rich chariot, about five or six o'clock, and being received with loud acclamations and "*Vivats*," as at Cambridge, she acknowledged the latter in Latin, often repeating as she went along, "*Gratias ago! Gratias ago!*" But at Carfax being addressed in Greek, she in *Greek* also returned her thanks, with some apologies for not answering the speech itself, being afraid to attempt it before such a company.

When she had got to Christ Church, and arrived at the hall door, a speech was made by the public orator, and thence she proceeded to the chapel, where the *Te Deum* was sung, after which she was conducted to her lodgings. Many of the members of Christ Church retired to make room for her company and attendants, *Cecil* being one of those who were constantly with the Queen, as the author of the Latin account of this great ceremony has been careful to record :— "*Commoratique sunt ibidem per hosce dies Comites Leicestria, Oxon. Warwic, D. Will. Howard, D. Sheffield, Mr. Will. Cecil, Secretarius, Mr. Francis Knolles, atque alii, quia studentes omnes sese receperunt in alia loca vicina, præter præbendarios quosdam.*"

After the account we have given of the Queen's reception and entertainment at Cambridge, it must seem unnecessary to detain the reader with a repetition of public exercises and exhibitions so similar, and which, indeed, are described so much at length in other books, as to render it altogether needless for us to do more than to refer to the publications in which these things appear, but particularly to a work so well known, and of such extensive detail, as Nichols' *Progresses* ; under the year 1566, almost every thing that could be said upon the subject, is to be found, as copiously and fully related as we have already shewn to be the case with regard to the Cambridge visit ; such public solemnities are not to be passed over in a *Life of Lord Burghley*, who, even at Oxford, appears to have received as many marked attentions as when he had to receive and entertain Elizabeth at Cambridge, as Chancellor ; and not without reason, since the affairs of both Universities seem almost equally to have been submitted to his

\* In the account of this visit in Nichols's *Progresses*, it is said, "This gift was the first in money, that ever as I can yet learn, was presented to a prince ;" but in the account *preceding* of the Queen's visit to Coventry in 1565, it is particularly stated, as we have before shewn, that the Mayor presented to the Queen a purse with 100*l.* in gold. It is difficult to reconcile these two accounts ; Wood is the authority for the first.

care and the decision of his judgment, in all emergencies, during his long and arduous administration. It would utterly surprise any person to read the many letters, still extant, in English and Latin, particularly addressed to him by the most learned and conspicuous members of both Universities.

It should be mentioned, that during this visit to Oxford, on Friday, the 6th of September, he was created and incorporated a Master of Arts, together with the following noble and distinguished persons :—

1. Edward, Earl of Oxford.
2. William Howard, Baron of Effingham.
3. Thomas Butler, Earl of Ormond.
4. Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick.
5. Henry Lord Strange, son of Edward Earl of Derby.
6. Edward Stafford, Lord Stafford.
7. John Sheffield, Lord Sheffield.
8. Sir WILLIAM CECIL, Secretary of State.
9. Sir Edward Rogers, Comptroller of the Household.
10. Sir Francis Knollys, Knight.
11. Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, Knight.
12. John Tamworth, Esq. of the Queen's Privy Chamber.

The Queen concluded her visit to Oxford as she had done at Cambridge, by a Latin speech, to be seen in Nichols, varying somewhat from that to be found in Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, but which is duly accounted for in the work referred to.

While these things were passing at *Oxford*, the sister University was much disturbed with the old dispute about habits and ceremonies, which the Chancellor, as usual, endeavoured to allay ; recommending in his letters to the Vice-Chancellor, and other Heads of Colleges, that every means should be used to bring in peace and uniformity.—See *Strype's Annals*, vol. i. part ii. 217.

It was not long after the Queen's visit to Oxford that the Parliament assembled, viz. on Monday the 30th of September, 1566, being the 8th year of her reign. This was no new Parliament, as some have supposed, but the same as had met in 1563, prolonged and continued by successive prorogations, that is, by six in all ; two in the year 1563, in the 5th year of the Queen's reign, and the four others, in the 6th, 7th, and 8th years. Had it been a new Parliament, the Queen would probably have opened it in person, as upon former occasions, but she only came to the House, after Parliament had assembled, to receive the

new Speaker of the House of Commons on the 2d of October, the former Speaker, Williams, being dead. An occurrence requiring to be with all form notified to her Majesty ; and for which purpose Sir William Cecil appears to have been one of four persons, “ chief members of the House of Commons,” as they are called in D’Ewes, specially deputed. The others, being Sir Edward Rogers, Comptroller, Sir Francis Knollys, Vice-Chamberlain,\* and Sir Ambrose Cave, Chancellor of the Duchy. This notification having been made to her Majesty by four Peers, in conjunction with the four Commoners already mentioned, and the Lower House having been commanded, and obtained leave to proceed to the election of a new Speaker, their choice fell upon Richard Onslow, Esq. Solicitor General to the Queen ; who was accordingly presented to her Majesty, on the said 2d of October,† and being at the bar of the House of Lords, delivered a speech, to be seen in D’Ewes’ Journal, which speech, according to the custom in such proceedings, being entirely in depreciation of his own qualifications, was as soon answered, and all objections overruled, by the Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, at the Queen’s command.

Her Majesty was put to much trouble by the proceedings of this Parliament, touching her marriage and the succession to the crown. At the beginning of the business, conferences between the two Houses being judged requisite, we find Sir William Cecil constantly nominated as one of the delegates of the Lower House, and afterwards when it came to be settled that thirty members of each House should have conference with her Majesty upon these points, he was one of the thirty sent up by the Commons, his office indeed as Secretary, and his being of the privy-council, naturally pointing him out as a person not to be passed over.

It appears to have been entirely against the Queen’s consent that the Parliament took this matter up in the way it did,‡ but the steps taken in the sessions of 1563, being deemed nugatory, from her Majesty’s having been brought to no

\* It appears to have been in this year that Sir Francis was first appointed Vice-Chamberlain, Captain of the Queen’s Guard, and Lieutenant of the county of Oxford. See *Lodge*, i. 311. *Illustrations*.

† On this occasion we find Sir William Cecil sitting within the bar, on the woolsack with the judges.

‡ The Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Pembroke, and Leicester, are supposed to have been the promoters of this measure. [*Keralio*.] Among Lord Burghley’s memorandums, the following occurs : “ 1566. Oct. 17. Certen Lords, viz. Erle of Pembroke, and Leicester, wer excluded the presence chamber for furderyng the proposition of the succession to be declared in Parliament, without the Queen’s allowance.”



determination upon the subject, some in both Houses judged, that the original measure should be pursued, and pressed to some conclusion, especially as far as regarded the succession. The competitors had now become numerous, and it is probable that they had all their several advocates and partisans. Some of course were earnest for the Queen of *Scots*; some judged her mother-in-law, the *Lady Lennox* to have a higher claim, as nearer by one degree to *Margaret of Scotland*, eldest daughter of Henry VII.; others were for the *Suffolk* line, represented by the Lady *Catherine*, supposed to be married to the Earl of Hertford, or by her younger sister, the Lady *Eleanor*, Countess of Cumberland. Darnley's claim of course hung upon that of his mother, but the new-born offspring of himself and the Queen of Scots, seemed so to unite and concentrate two of the conflicting, or principal claims, as to render the Scotch titles the least questionable of all. The great point to be decided, however, was in reality, whether at this time any heir at all should be publicly proclaimed. There is great reason to think that Elizabeth herself, in regard to the right, preferred the Scotch claim, but Mary's Catholic connexions seemed decidedly to render such a declaration dangerous, and the more it was pressed and demanded by Mary, the more suspicious it became to Elizabeth. It should also be considered, that in the same degree that Elizabeth's Catholic subjects might be pleased with the nomination of Mary, those of her Protestant subjects who had beheld and lamented the severities of the last reign, might be expected to feel alarmed and dispirited at the nomination of a *Popish* successor.\* The case was undeniably one of great difficulty to Elizabeth, though some have written upon it, as though Mary's demand were altogether so reasonable, as not to be denied, except from motives of the most despicable jealousy and selfishness on the part of Elizabeth. In the mean while, the question constantly threw Elizabeth into fresh difficulties concerning her own marriage, difficulties calculated to expose her all the world over, having not only to *dismiss* some high offers, at the hazard of offence, almost every year, but perhaps forced or provoked to *entertain* others without any sincere purposes of bringing them to a favourable conclusion; while her secret and private sentiments and intentions were enveloped in such deep mystery, as to be beyond

\* "Les papiers d'état de ce temps forment un témoignage incontestable des intrigues d'Elizabeth en Ecosse et de celles de Marie en Angleterre. Tous les Anglois Catholiques étoient partisans des droits et de la personne de Marie; la cour d'Elizabeth s'étoit déclarée en sa faveur, et la plupart, des grands; excepté *Cecil*, paroissoient convaincus de la nécessité de nommer cette princesse hérétique de la couronne."—*Keralio*. We doubt the truth of this.

the penetration as it would appear, of some of her wisest and most confidential advisers.

To avert the first attacks of the present Parliament upon the point of succession, she allowed the Secretary and other Privy Counsellors to assure the House of Commons that she had been "moved to marry, and that she was minded, for the wealth of her Commons, to prosecute the same—and that she, therefore, advised the House to see the sequel of that before they made further suit touching the declaration of a successor." But, some of the members were for pressing matters on, considering the present measures but as a continuation or renewal of what had passed in the former sessions of 1563; and which, after a lapse of many years, left the question just where it was. This brought on the conferences between the two Houses of which we have spoken above, and the deputation of thirty Lords and thirty Commoners to attend the Queen at Whitehall, on the 5th of November, where she was addressed by the Lord Keeper in a long speech, to be seen also in D'Ewes' Journal, with her Majesty's answer; obscure enough, certainly, but, on this account, perhaps, the more honest; for how could she decide upon points in regard to which, perhaps, her own feelings and sentiments hung upon contingencies and upon events which it was impossible sufficiently to calculate or foresee. She certainly, however, endeavoured to turn aside the question concerning the succession, by assurances that she would marry; and the Secretary and Sir Edward Rogers were empowered to proffer such assurances: but it had not the effect of bringing matters to a termination; for, upon a motion being made, after the answer returned, to renew the suit to her Majesty for limitation of the succession, she appears to have been so offended as to send commands to the two Houses that they should proceed no farther in it. Such interference, however, being questioned as an invasion of their liberties and privileges, the business appeared in the end to be hushed up by the Queen's revoking her *commands*, and only *requiring* the House to suspend matters for a time; "which revocation was taken of all the House most joyfully," says D'Ewes, "with most hearty prayer for the Queen, and thanks to her for the same."\*

In the course and progress of this discussion, some rude speeches were made against the Queen,† against Cecil, and against another person, who was sup-

\* Strype's Annals, i. part ii. 237.

† See Camden, and Hallam's Constitutional History of England, 135. In Lord Burghley's own notes the following entry occurs, Oct. 6, 1566. "Certen lewd bills throwne abroad against the Q. Majesty for not assenting to have the matter of succession procede in Parliament, and bills also to charge."

posed to have dissuaded the Queen from marriage on the ground of some natural impediment ; Dr. Huick, her physician. But to the Secretary the chief blame seems to have been imputed by the adverse party ; a party strangely enough headed by Leicester, who, as Melvil relates, was become the Queen *his* mistress' avowed friend, having twice applied to Queen Elizabeth, to declare Mary to be her heir, alleging it would be her greatest security, and crying out in anger that CECIL would undo all. We may see by this how very divided the Court was at this time, and how difficult it must have been for Elizabeth to know exactly what to do. Leicester's conduct is the more surprising, because, as a pretended Puritan and despoiler of Church property, he could never seriously desire to have a Popish successor ; and his friend Sir Francis Knollys, a real and true Puritan, appears to have been quite on the other side. The hazard to the nation of an undeclared succession, in case of any thing fatal happening to Elizabeth, was well set forth in the speech of the Lord Keeper, at Whitehall, on the 5th of November ; but, the hazard Elizabeth might run in *declaring* her successor is not less ably disclosed and insisted upon in Camden's account of the transaction, and to which, as perhaps one of the best accounts to be given of this unpleasant affair, we would wish to refer.

On the last day of the Parliament the Queen made a speech, in which she did not hesitate to reprove the sharpness\* of the proceedings, with regard to the succession ; distinguishing between those who had been the prime plotters and authors of the attack upon her ; those who had been actors in it, and with smooth words carried their point ; those who had given too great credence to those smooth words, and those who had been silent, whom she approved the most—of the majority she professed to think well, and to hold them all in as much kindness as heretofore, even from her heart. As they had offered an extraordinary subsidy to prevail with her to name a successor, she absolutely refused to accept it, and at the same time freely remitted a fourth part of a subsidy previously granted ; saying, *That money in her subjects' coffers, was as good as in her own.* "Thus," says Camden, "a woman's wisdom suppressed these com-

\* Considering the high notions of the royal prerogative, entertained, and in a great degree admitted, till long past the reign of Elizabeth ; we may wonder more at the liberties taken in the House of Commons, on this and other occasions during the Queen's reign, than at the arbitrary interference and sharp reproofs of the Sovereign.—The time was yet to come for putting these constitutional rights and privileges on a proper and more respectable footing.—See *Hume's 3d Appendix*, vol. v. 8vo. Edit. 1797.



motions, which time so qualified, shining clearer and clearer, that very few but such as were seditious and timorous, were troubled with care about a successor."

As if, however, it had been to keep her promise with Mary, to do nothing against her title (or suffer nothing to be done against it with her consent), Thornton, Reader of Law at Lincoln's Inn, was sent to the Tower at this time, for having in his readings called in question the title of the Queen of Scots.

On Thursday the 2d of January, 1566-7, anno 9. Eliz., the Parliament was dissolved. In the above Parliament, to give greater security to the Protestant Church of England, a bill was introduced and passed, to confirm the consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and to obviate all doubts raised and encouraged by the Papists, particularly Boner. The occasion of this bill is fully explained by Strype, and pains taken to shew, that in fact, the consecration of the Protestant Archbishops and Bishops, was good by former statutes, and that every thing had been done to render the ceremony as valid and perfect as upon all former occasions. While the Protestant Bishops were thus amply secured against the calumnies of the Papists, the Popish Bishops still remaining were as mercifully absolved from all pains and penalties incurred by their refusal of the oath of supremacy. Even Boner, who was still living, and who had been certified in the Queen's Court at Westminster, as one that had incurred the penalties, had the full benefit of this act. Heath, Archbishop of York, had died in this very year; he was in principle a firm Catholic, but of a mild and benevolent disposition; after having, as Chancellor, proposed Elizabeth to the Parliament, as successor to Mary, he voluntarily resigned the Seals, and submitting with the greatest patience to the sentence of deprivation, retired to his manor of Cobham in Surrey; "where," says Camden, "the Queen, with whom he was in great grace, visited him many times with marvellous kindness."\*

The Secretary was still much troubled by the proceedings at Cambridge, and obliged to write to the Vice-Chancellor, in strong terms, to put a stop to the disputing and wrangling about trifling matters, and to endeavour by all reasonable modes of discipline to enforce order and uniformity.

Pope Pius V. had scarcely assumed the tiara, before he put forth a Bull against heretics, "In the name of the Holy Trinity, of the Blessed Mother of God, of St. Peter and St. Paul, of the holy host of heaven, of the archangels and angels, of the holy apostles, saints, and martyrs," willing and authorizing all the wise and learned of his Clergy, to labour, endeavour, and contrive all

\* Lodge's Illustrations.

manner of devices, to abate, assuage, and confound them; anathematizing all heretics, living, trading, or travelling in any colonies, principalities, realms and countries, subject to the see of St. Peter, his predecessor; that thereby they might either be reclaimed, or a total infamy be brought upon them, by their discord and divisions—by which means, they might either speedily perish by God's wrath, or continue in eternal difference.\*

We are sorry to say, this Bull exhibits but a too just picture of the devices, properly so called, against which Cecil had constantly to guard his country and his Sovereign, as we shall have occasion to shew. It was dated on the 6th of the Ides of May at Rome—and contained dispensations for every insidious compliance with the new doctrines, tenets, laws, and manners, of the heretics, which might tend to throw them into confusion, or in any way promote the interests of the holy see of Rome.—A Jesuit of great authority was dispatched from Paris to Ireland, to instruct the Pope's emissaries, how to assume every disguise, and disseminate every false doctrine they could invent, and a private agent from the Pope was especially sent into England, under colour of an Italian factor. This man's name was Ridolpho; and we shall find him doing his utmost to set the Papists against the Queen, and very officiously meddling in the concerns of Scotland.

An account will be found in Strype (*Annals*, i. ch. xlviiii.) under this year, of the *Secretary's* attention to an address made to him by the Governor of Jersey, to stay, if possible, the departure of a learned foreigner from that island, who in the character of a schoolmaster or instructor of youth, had wrought such good there, that it was hoped he might be induced to stay, if the Secretary could procure him to be naturalized, by the Queen's letters-patent. The consequence was that he was induced to stay, having with him there his father and mother. His name was Adrian *Saravia*, a native of the Low Countries, eminent afterwards in the Church, and a great defender of episcopacy against *Beza*. The following is the letter he wrote to *Cecil* (whom he called his *patron*), when he had made up his mind to continue at Jersey.

“Ornatissimo Viro Guilielmo Cecilio patrono suo, Adrianus Saravius, S.P.D.

“Nequa forte animi levitate aut inconstantia, vir ornatissime, factum putes, quod, ut statueram, ad meos Belgas me non contulerim, rationem tibi paucis exponam; dimissionem a fratibus, qui hic sunt, impetrare non potui; abire autem

\* In the Bull of Canonization of Pius V., 1712; among his high virtues entitling him to such honours, this is one, his “unhesitating zeal in striking with his dread anathema, the impious *heretic* QUEEN ELIZABETH, the *pretended* Queen of England.”

ipsis invitis cum mala ipsorum gratiâ, mihi res prorsus indigna visum est; propterea ego hic habeo apud me utrumque meum parentem, quos, Gandavo, cum turbæ illic inciperent, revocavi. At me, cum illis, uxore et liberis, in turbulentam præcipitare tempestatem, cum quid opus hoc rerum statu patriæ meæ afferre queam, incertus sum, consilium mihi visum non est. Hi sunt trabales clavi, qui me hic affixum detinuerunt. Interea mi domine, si tibi indignus non videar, municeps et civis vester fieri vehementer cupio; de hac gente nihil scribo, nisi quod nunquam sibi sit futura dissimilis, vale. Guerzea. prid. cal. Februarii."

We learn from Lord Burghley's Diary, that he had in the course of this year two severe fits of illness.

"May 6. I was sore sick at Greenwich;" and,

"November 29. I was first grieved with the gout, in the Parliament time at Westminster, and hardly used, by means of Justice Browne, as the Earl of Sussex can tell." What connexion the latter circumstance had with his illness, we are at a loss to say, unless by the exhibition of some *nostrum* for a cure; which was so commonly the case in those days, that from the papers in the Museum, we might almost venture to affirm, that Lord Burghley never laboured under any fit of sickness, without his friends and acquaintance, from all parts, prescribing for him. We do not, however, mean to speak seriously of this being a right interpretation of Justice Browne's hard usage, though we know not what else it relates to.

Lord Burghley records the death of two eminent men, as having occurred on the same day in this year, April 21. "Sir Richard *Sackville*, under Treasurer of the Exchequer, and Sir John *Mason*,\* Treasurer of the Chamber, died both in one day;" and then follows, "Sir Walter *Mildmay*, made Chancellor and under Treasurer of the Exchequer, anno 8vo. Eliz."—"An upright and most advised man," says Camden; of whom we shall have more to say hereafter.

\* See of Sir John Mason, vol. i. 663. and Lodge's Illustrations of British History, vol. i. 277. Sir Richard Sackville had been of the Privy Council in the reigns of Edward and Mary. He first studied the law, and became so great a proficient in it, as to be appointed the Lent-reader at Gray's Inn, in the time of Henry VIII. His mother was a Bullen, and nearly related to the Queen's mother. He became exceedingly rich before he died, and had the nickname given him of *Fill-sack*, which, so far from implying covetousness, as many have thought, is judged by Collins only to have bespoke the good success of a wise and prudent economy. As he represented successively the *counties* of Kent and Sussex, it is not to be supposed that he could be guilty of so *unpopular* a failure as parsimony. He was father to the first Earl of Dorset, the celebrated poet. Sir *William Cecil*, as well as the successor of Sir Richard in the Exchequer, Sir *Walter Mildmay*, was made one of his ex ecutors.



## CHAP VIII.

1567.

Ninth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign commenced November 17, 1566.

*Darnley's illness—Of Mary and Bothwell—Darnley's murder—Passage from Bishop Grindal's letter to Bullinger—Melvil's account of Mary, Darnley, and Bothwell—Of Mary's conduct towards Darnley—Bothwell's trial—Beton's letter to Mary—Mary carried to Bothwell's castle—Bothwell divorced—Mary marries him—Bothwell tries to get possession of the young Prince—Mary surrenders herself—Bothwell's flight—Throckmorton sent by Elizabeth—Mary's resignation—James crowned—Murray Regent—Fate of Bothwell—Overtures of marriage with the Archduke—Lord Sussex sent—Sir H. Sydney Lord Deputy of Ireland—Calais—Shan O'Niel—Confederacy of the Popish States—Articles of it—Incessant applications to Cecil—Attack on the Clergy—Dean Nowell—Dorman—Bishop Jewel—Attempt in Lancashire to restore Popery—Bishop of Carlisle—Faithful Cummin—Death of Dr. Nicholas Wotton—Queen's Progresses.*

AT the very commencement of this year we are naturally brought back to the melancholy account of proceedings in Scotland, it being equally the last year of Darnley's life and of Mary's freedom. But we need not dwell long on the very dismal and distressing circumstances of this eventful period of our history, because no other history perhaps has been so often related, or so critically and closely examined in all its parts. Could we have unhesitatingly decided in favour of Mary's innocence, we do not feel that we have any purposes to answer by proclaiming her guilt, except to account for the conduct of those who did not believe her to be innocent. Guilty or innocent, we think all that followed in regard to *England*, will be found to have *principally* depended on other circumstances.—Were we indeed ever so persuaded, that Mary had no concern whatever in the death of Darnley, we should feel obliged to confess, that she could scarcely have done more to excite the liveliest *suspensions* of it, than by the course she is on all hands allowed to have pursued ; the ground for such suspicions requires to be examined, therefore, in common justice to those who have

been accused, not only of slandering, but of cruelly persecuting, the pure and innocent; and none more so than the subject of this Memoir, as we have but too often occasion to remind the reader. Darnley parted from the Queen in anger and disgust, after the ceremony of the royal baptism at Stirling; in anger, because he was deprived of all the regal honours and distinctions profusely bestowed on him at first; in disgust, because he felt that while he was discarded and dishonoured in his own person, others were admitted to so extraordinary a degree of favour and confidence, as might very naturally have excited the most lively jealousy in stronger and less suspicious minds than his was known to be. Bothwell's *principles* and *general conduct*, were by no means such as to justify the extraordinary attentions paid to him, at such a moment, by a female of such attractions as Mary must have known herself to be. Two impediments stood in Bothwell's way, if he looked to any participation of her throne and her bed, and both impediments were in a very short time removed, and Mary actually married to the very person, of whom the discarded and degraded Darnley was most jealous, when he quitted the Court to go to Glasgow, with a settled and, to all appearance, an irremovable purpose of passing beyond sea.\*

Immediately on his leaving Stirling to proceed to Glasgow, he was seized with a very alarming and unsightly illness; his blood being so affected, and his disfigurement so great, that he was supposed to be poisoned, an event much too common in those days to excite any great degree of surprise. Had he died one of Bothwell's impediments would have been effectually removed.† Her heart already to all appearance estranged, Mary's hand would have been free again, and one only impediment would have still stood in Bothwell's way towards a matrimonial union with the high and accomplished Queen of Scots; in fact, *Lady Bothwell was living*, a sister of the Earl of Huntley.

Notwithstanding the sudden and strange illness with which Darnley had been seized on quitting Stirling, he was able to reach Glasgow, and, contrary to expectation, seemed to be so much in the way to overcome the complaint, that in a short time, perhaps, he might have been able to fulfil his purposes of quitting Scotland, and proceeding to the Continent. This would have been no

\* We might, perhaps, refer the reader at once to *Hume*; but as those who have most calumniated the great statesman whose life we are writing have appeared since Hume, and in opposition to him, we cannot avoid going over much of the same ground.

† It seems certain that Mary sent her own physician to visit him in his illness. The suspicion of poison seems to rest on very weak grounds.

removal of the grand impediment to Bothwell's marriage with the Queen, for he would have still continued, and appeared in foreign Courts, as her husband and King of Scotland.\* A divorce indeed had been proposed to Mary by Murray's party, but such a separation, she seems to have thought, might have affected the succession of her son, as heir both to Scotland and England; besides Mary does not appear to have wished, by a divorce, to restore Murray to the situation he formerly held as her Minister.

It was under these circumstances that she took the resolution of going to Glasgow, to be reconciled to Darnley, to comfort him in his illness, to turn him aside, if possible, from his design of passing from Glasgow (where he had a vessel prepared), to foreign parts, and to induce him, for change of air, to pass to the very opposite side of Scotland; in fact, to Edinburgh; not to the palace, but a separate dwelling, where it was alleged the air was purer and the chance of recovery greater. He consented to the removal, and to every other arrangement that had been made for him. Mary attended upon him, in the house assigned for his dwelling, and sometimes slept in a room nigh to his; but being

\* One of Mary's advocates has a strange way of defending her from all participation in Darnley's death; he thinks nothing could have been more *favourable* to her purposes, than to have allowed him to go abroad. "Le depart de Darnley ne lui étoit-il pas plus favorable que tout ce qu'elle pouvoit imaginer; elle demouroit en liberté, sa passion pour Bothwell pouvoit éclater sans contrainte, et Henri hors du Royaume, elle pouvoit lui en interdire le retour, et même dans les pays étrangers, le faire périr loin d'elle par des mains inconnues." Surely this is little better than admitting that she went the *shortest way* to work, if her accusers have any ground to stand on; which is the only question in dispute. Tytler makes (or rather adopt) the same mistake of fancying that Darnley's departure into foreign countries would have served Mary's purposes better, supposing her attached to Bothwell, than the keeping him at home; and he looks upon it as a thing clearly proved, that Mary's endeavours to prevent Darnley from leaving the kingdom, proceeded entirely from tenderness and affection for him. And yet the Earl of Bedford, who by all accounts was really a good man, had assured Cecil in August, 1566, that she did in no manner dissemble her dislike of Darnley, and had fallen out with Melvil for giving the King a dog, declaring she could trust no one who would give any thing to such a one as *she loved not*. She had indeed but too much reason to be offended with Darnley; but the question is, whether her affection for him was ever so thoroughly restored as her advocates pretend, and which makes a great difference as to the real character of the events which afterwards took place. The Earl of Bedford's letter may be seen in Robertson's appendix, No. xvii. vol. ii. 47.—Mad<sup>re</sup> de *Keralio*, who is profuse in her admiration of Mary's conduct in visiting her sick husband at Glasgow, is not disposed to agree with Stuart, in supposing that it proceeded from an absolute return of *affection*. "Marie Stuart," she says, "ne pouvoit *aimer* Darnley—mais son *ami sensible* pouvoit *pardonner*, &c."



one night called away, to attend a masque or fete at the palace, in honour of the marriage of one of her household, she took a *particular* leave of the King, putting a ring upon his finger in token of her love, and that very night he was destroyed, and the house blown to atoms by gunpowder !

It is true the Queen *might* be innocent of all this. One impediment, however, to Bothwell's wishes, was now effectually removed. We may assuredly be allowed to ask, did Mary allow him to take advantage of it? Yes; she made no objection to the removal of the *other* impediment, namely, the divorce of Lady Bothwell, and after the *pretence* (we can never bring ourselves to look upon it otherwise) of a violent ravishment and seizure of her person, consented to marry the very man who stood most suspected of the murder committed.—We can only say, if she were not guilty, the weakest woman that ever lived could not have given greater advantages to her enemies; advantages which we think have acquired additional force of late from the injudicious course taken by some of her avowed advocates; for it must surely be admitted, that no person had ever greater occasion given her to guard against *appearances*, than Mary at this time. It is only to defend those who we think have been made to bear more blame than of right attaches to them, that we can bring ourselves to insist so much on the imprudencies (to say no worse at present) of this most unfortunate Princess. One of those too zealous advocates to whom we have alluded (and no less eminent a person than Professor Tytler), thus writes of the Queen's voluntary reconciliation with Darnley: "The Queen, on *Christmas eve*, as a deed of *charity* and *benevolence* suitable to that solemn festival, granted a *free pardon* to Morton, Lindsay, and seventy-five more accomplices, in the *murder* of her Secretary! Was it strange that the heart which could pardon the perpetrators of so black a murder, attended with such horrid circumstances as to herself, should expand, and receive into grace Lord Darnley, who had been seduced by their artifice? Darnley, the husband of her affection, the father of her infant son, now a penitent, and on the bed of sickness?" He then proceeds to exclaim in most bitter terms against those who could so much as *insinuate*, that there was any *artifice* or *dissimulation* in this, observing, that merely to suppose such a thing, was to impute to "the tender-hearted and affectionate Queen Mary, a most inhuman, deliberate, and remorseless murder;" indeed, he introduces these horrid consequences of *supposing her guilty* with an "*horresco referens*;" in justice then to those who may have been misled by *appearances*, we feel bound in a Life of Lord Burghley, one of her *reputed enemies*, to state what those

*appearances* were. The free and gracious pardon of Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, &c. is said above to have been granted on Christmas eve *in honour of the season*. This was but a few weeks after the celebrated conferences at Craigmillar. The purport of which, on the part of Murray, Lethington, Huntley, Argyle, and Bothwell, has, on all sides, been represented to be an effort to procure the Queen's pardon for Morton, &c., on an express stipulation that she should be released from Darnley by a formal divorce (to which Mary objected), or by some other *undefined* mode of *separation*, which was, it should be observed, *left undefined* to the last; that Mary desired that it should be some lawful expedient, and neither injurious to herself or her son is most true; but she allowed Maitland to utter all manner of reproaches against Darnley, and was easily brought to consent to the other measure of pardoning Morton and his party for a most atrocious crime (especially in persons of their rank in *life* and *age*), while Darnley, still only a youth of twenty, and who, Professor Tytler himself says, had been "seduced by their artifice," was to be divested of his crown, *if not of his life*; for two of the party, Huntley and Argyle, professed afterwards to have *understood* that *violence to his person* had been contemplated at Craigmillar. In the meanwhile Darnley was in the way to give them the slip, by going beyond sea as soon as he should be sufficiently recovered; but in January, Mary, as her advocates insist, became suddenly disposed to be reconciled to the King, and extremely anxious for his recovery; to which end, as Sir W. Drury wrote to Cecil, she designed to go, as he had heard, to fetch him away from Glasgow, and which indeed took place accordingly; but whither, and into what company did she carry him? To Edinburgh, indeed, but *not to the palace*; and to those very persons, Bothwell amongst the number, whom she *knew* to have an expedient in their head for dissolving the marriage bond, and some of whom besides, she must have known to be capable of committing or countenancing *murder*; and ten days only after the young King's arrival, he *was* murdered!

We would not wish to impose upon any person living, the arduous and laborious task of reading the many accounts we have felt it our duty to read, in elucidation of these disastrous events;\* but we cannot hesitate to repeat, that if Mary were innocent, she seems, as to all the moral proofs of guilt, to have been led so willingly to the consummation of Bothwell's wicked purposes, as to

\* Pinkerton offered to answer all that had been alleged by writers in favour of Mary Queen of Scots in a one shilling pamphlet, but not in a less space of time than *five years*.

leave no doubt on our minds as to the tendency and bent of her own inclinations.\*

We have dwelt merely on the most acknowledged and undisputed facts, and are quite willing now to leave them to the judgment of the reader, as circumstances leading, we think, but too regularly to the further catastrophe of her removal from the seat of Government,† not as an act of justice so much as of necessity; and yet not altogether of necessity, had the times been different, or had the admirable limitations of regal power, without any degradation of the prerogatives or honour of the crown, now admitted among us, been known or reduced to practice in any part or portion of the civilized world. We must consider what were the opinions prevalent at this time in Europe, in regard to the power of Princes. On one side stood the Pope, ready to depose all heretical Princes and Potentates, by a Papal Bull, sacred in the eyes of every zealous Catholic, and more so, perhaps, now than ever; because, amongst *heretics* it was losing its force, and required, therefore, to be upheld by all the severities of an inquisitorial court. On the other side stood the Calvinists, prepared to reduce the regal power, not merely within the limits of popular election or choice, but of moral fitness and personal qualifications for the government of a state or kingdom. Elizabeth's crown was in danger from the force of the first prejudice, and Mary's of the second. In the peculiar state of Scotland, at that time, she could not, perhaps, have done herself a greater injury, than to appear careless of the consequences of any immoral act, or deviation from the paths of moral rectitude, not to mention her Romish prejudices, connexions, and attachments.

But it is time that we should speak more particularly of the exact course of events.

Darnley appears to have left Stirling soon after the baptism of his son, December, 1566. On the 20th of January, 1566-7, Mary wrote a letter to her

\* Tytler certainly overdoes the matter, by representing her, even at this time, to have been a perfect paragon of virtue, tenderness, and purity.

† We have the following curious passage in a letter of Bishop Grindal, to the celebrated Bullinger in Switzerland, so strongly resting upon the mere fact of Mary's marriage with Bothwell as to deserve to be transcribed. His letter being dated June 21, 1567.—“*Quomodocunque sit, infames illæ nuptiæ, non possunt non in aliquam diram tragædiam desinere.*” We must remember that this was written at the time, and nearly twenty years before the last act of the tragedy took place; but it is surely no false assignment of the beginning of the tragedy.



Ambassador in France, in which are to be found no tokens of reconciliation or returning affection; and yet, almost immediately afterwards, she repaired to Glasgow, and by a show of reconciliation and kindly attentions, so wrought upon the King's mind, awakened, perhaps, to a renewed regard and affection on his part, as to induce him to submit to be conveyed by her directions, in a litter, to Edinburgh, to a lonely house half a mile from the palace, called the Kirk of Field, where, during the night of the 9th of February, he and a servant in attendance upon him, were deprived of their lives in some unknown and extraordinary manner; for though the room in which they slept was destroyed by gunpowder, and the very foundations of the house removed, their dead bodies were found in an adjacent garden, with no symptoms upon them of a death so violent, as must have been expected from an explosion of that nature.\*

Lord Burghley has, in his notes, two entries referring to the event.

"Feb. 9. The L. Darnly, K. of Scotts, was killed and murdered near Edenburgh."

The second is more explicit, as to the precise authors of the murder.

"—— 10. Hora secunda post mediam noctem. Hen. Rex Scotiæ interfec-tus fuit, per Jac. Co. Bothwell, Jac. Ormeston de Ormston, Hob. Ormston, patrem dicti Jac. Ormston, Tho. Hepbourn."†

There can be no doubt that the murder was no sooner committed, than Bothwell was accused of being the murderer; nor had Mary's conduct and actions been so guarded, to say the least of them, as to screen her from the weight of similar imputations. It was necessary, in order to satisfy the public, to

\* Since the above was written, Mr. Turner has brought together from Keith, Anderson, Melvil, and others, the most circumstantial points.—See his xxiii. Letter, Book ii. He has also noticed the confessions taken, but with caution, as he is in no manner disposed to put more confidence in them, than every particular case would seem to warrant.

† This was, probably, the first account Sir William received, and it happens to agree exactly with what was afterwards reported to the Queen by Throckmorton, July 18, 1567.—*Goodall's Preface*, xvii. In the mean while *Cecil's* information seems to have had no real certainty in it, for on the 20th of February he wrote to Sir Henry Norris, as may be seen in the *Cabala*, "The most suspicion that I can hear is of the Earl of Bothwell." And again, "The common speech toucheth the Earls of Bothwell and Huntley, who remain with the Queen." Lastly, on March 21, "The common fame in Scotland continueth upon the Earl of Bothwell to be the principal murderer of the King, and the Queen's name is not well spoken of." How much Mary was suspected *all over Europe*, she was informed by her own Ambassador at Paris, the Archbishop of Glasgow.

make some show of willingness to bring the culprit to account for an atrocity so great, and a formal proclamation was made, to summon accusers. Bothwell, however, still continuing at large, and in as much favour as ever with the Queen,\* the King's father, Lord Lennox, was not tardy in demanding vengeance to be had of the guilty person, and *Bothwell* was, in the end, openly and publicly accused by him; but, through a default of evidence, in consequence of the *haste* with which the proceedings were carried on, and the accused appearing with an alarming force of vassals and followers to overawe all opposed to him, even the Judges of the Court, he was formally acquitted.† The indecent precipitation with which these things were conducted,‡ the little attention paid to Lennox, who solicited a longer delay to collect his witnesses, the bold effrontery with which Bothwell conducted himself, even sitting in the very Council assembled to appoint and arrange his trial, only tended the more to inflame the minds of the people. Placards were stuck up, and banners displayed, proclaiming his guilt, and not sparing the Queen. Lennox felt himself so ill used, as even to apply to Elizabeth for her interposition to stay the trial, but all in vain. Neither Lennox nor Elizabeth could prevail to procure any postponement, so that the accusers being absolutely precluded from making their appearance according to the customary forms of law, the process was dropped, and a sentence of acquittal pronounced, for want of the accusation being supported on the day of trial, as it was pretended. But Melvil's account, who was on the spot, is as follows: "Every body," he says, "suspected the Earl of Bothwell, and those who durst speak freely to others said that it was he; whereupon he drew together a number of Lords, of his dependers, to

\* Melvil's account is most extraordinary, in regard to the conduct of the Queen and Bothwell. He tells us, "that on the very next morning after the *murder* (and even *he* calls it so), he came to the door of the Queen's chamber, and the *Earl of Bothwell* said, that her Majesty was sorrowful and quiet, which occasioned him to come forth. He said, the strangest accident had fallen out which ever was heard of, for thunder had come out of the sky, and had burnt the King's house, and himself was found lying a little distance from the house under a tree. He desired me to go up and see him, how that there was not a hurt or a mark on all his body; but, when I went up to see him, he had been taken up to a chamber, and kept by one Alexander Denham, and I could not get a sight of him."

† See Anderson, Keith, and Laing.

‡ Mad<sup>lle</sup>. Keralio has been at great pains to clear the Queen of all participation in this hurried process of acquittal; but as she seems to think that Mary judged Bothwell to be innocent, it is impossible to place much reliance on her arguments.

be an Assize, which cleared and acquitted him. Some for fear, some for favour, and the greatest part in expectation of advantage. This way being assailed, he remained still the greatest favourite at Court." The trial, indeed, was not allowed to take place before the Queen. In addition to numerous other lucrative appointments, she dislodged the Earl of Mar from the government of Edinburgh Castle, and bestowed it on Bothwell; thus giving him custody of the chiefest fortress in the kingdom. How little consonant must this have been to the advice of her Ambassador at Paris, Archbishop Beton, to whom she had written on the death of the King. This respectable Prelate (for he certainly was so, see vol. i. p. 101.), in his reply, had expressed to her the horror excited in France by the account of the murder; he had announced to her the fact of her being herself suspected; had availed himself of the circumstance insisted upon by herself, of her own providential and miraculous escape, to urge upon her the absolute necessity of discovering and punishing the offenders, to redeem her reputation from obloquy; for the sinister interpretations and reproaches of Europe, he adds, were "ow'r (over) odious to rehearse." Elizabeth gave her the same advice, when writing to her on Lennox's request to postpone the trial; but which Mary's advocates scruple not to call insolent and impertinent.—[See Laing's Dissertation on the Murder of Darnley.] Mr. Turner has placed this whole transaction in a very striking point of view, and certainly with strong marks of impartiality.

The next step taken in the business, if Buchanan and Camden are right, was one so extraordinary, as hitherto to have baffled the utmost pains of the most eminent historians to account for it. Bothwell, at a great entertainment he gave, procured a paper to be signed by the Nobles who had attended the Parliament, immediately after his acquittal, actually recommending him to the Queen as the *most proper person* she could choose for a husband. The difficulty of accounting for this is the greater, because it was signed by persons of the most adverse parties;\* and, as it would appear, by some of the Queen's best friends, who were not blind to the hazard she would be incurring by a measure so extraordinary, in all its circumstances, as to marry the reputed murderer of her former husband; a man of dissolute and abandoned habits, the husband of

\* Whitaker has gone as far as any into the scrutiny of these signatures, as they are to be found in Sir James Balfour's copy of the Bond, in the Scotch College at Paris, and in what is called *Cecil's* copy (which he prefers) in the Museum.—*Cotton. MSS. Caligula*, c. i. 1.



another woman, and of no repute in other countries. If any case can be compared with this, perhaps we may find something similar in the transaction upon which we felt obliged to dwell so long in our first volume, we mean that of the Duke of Northumberland, in his attempts to set the Lady Jane Grey on the throne of England. Some perhaps, in this case, as well as in the other, signed through intimidation (for Bothwell, it is asserted by many, had been careful to have the house surrounded at the time with his dependants armed); some, through a carelessness as to the consequences, \* supposing it would prove nugatory and invalid, as any deliberate act of their own; some, perhaps, for private ends, to be answered by Bothwell's elevation; and finally, some, perhaps, in confidence that his rashness would *ruin* him.†

But there were still two acts more remaining to be performed of this extraordinary *drama*; (for fiction seems to have been at the bottom of all.) It was judged necessary that the Queen should not assent so willingly to the match, as to appear to be the author of it; or, as some have alleged, a fresh crime was to be committed, that, by a pardon for the latter, all former crimes might be covered, according to the custom of Scotland, where the particular crime for which a pardon was granted being specified, it was usual to add, "and all other wicked acts." Bothwell therefore having, according to Buchanan and Camden, armed himself with the public instrument before spoken of, not only recommending him to the Queen as her third husband, but containing promises of support and defence, in the prosecution of his designs, from the first Nobles of the land, seized an opportunity of so intercepting her on a journey, as to leave her no choice of doing otherwise than accept him, according to the terms prescribed by the Nobility: he met her near Linlithgow, dispersed

\* Hume can discover no reason for this extraordinary confederacy, but that all the subscribers were firmly persuaded that Mary was fully determined to marry him. Still he thinks they were taken by surprise.

† Mary's advocates, of course, refer the whole proceeding to Murray, for the ruin of Mary as well as Bothwell; and it has been insisted upon, though he could not have been present, that his name stood first among the subscribers. We have no occasion to enter into the controversy, as it is fully discussed in other books; though it seems to have been a good deal overlooked, that Murray's name might have been forged, as the Queen's warrant is said to have been. Altogether it may be placed among the mysteries of this most extraordinary story, which it is scarcely necessary to clear up, since, however recommended, Mary *should not have married Bothwell*.

the small train that attended her, seized on her person, and conveyed her, with as few attendants as possible, to his castle at Dunbar.\*

If it be inquired, whether this high-spirited Princess made any resistance to so gross an indignity, it must be answered, No.† Melvil was one of her courtiers, in actual attendance upon her, and he has by his silence, at least, avouched for its having been otherwise; he was told indeed, he says, by one of Bothwell's attendants, that it was done "with the Queen's own consent."

\* We have placed the above transactions in the order in which they stand in *Buchanan* and *Camden*, who concur in putting the letter of approbation before the seizure of Mary's person, making the latter a consequence of the former. But as Rapin is more disposed to follow Melvil, and thinks Camden had an interest in misplacing the facts, and misrepresenting the purport of the paper, we shall subjoin Melvil's account, who clearly speaks of the consent of the Lords as obtained subsequently to the seizure, alleging the latter as one reason for it, though a strange one certainly; and indeed his account cannot but be wrong, from the dates preserved.—(See Laing and Whitaker). "Shortly after her Majesty went to Stirling, and in her back-coming, betwixt Linlithgow and Edinburgh, the Earl of Bothwell rencountered her with a great company, and took her Majesty's horse by the bridle; his men took the Earl of Huntley, the Secretary Liddington, and me, and carried us captives to Dunbar: all the rest were permitted to go free. There the Earl of Bothwell boasted he would marry the Queen, who would or would not; yea, whether she would herself or not. Captain Blackater, who had taken me, alleged that it was with the Queen's own consent. The next day, in Dunbar, I obtained permission to go home. *Afterward* the Court came to Edinburgh, and there a number of Noblemen were drawn together in a chamber within the Palace, where they all subscribed a paper, declaring, that they judged it was much the Queen's interest to marry Bothwell, he having many friends in Lothian, and upon the borders, which would cause good order to be kept. And then the Queen could not but marry him, seeing he had ravished her, and lain with her against her will."—By the Duke of Norfolk's letter to Elizabeth, from York, Oct. 11, 1568, the consent of the Lords seems to have been obtained on the 19th of April, and the subduction of the Queen to have taken place on the 24th.—(*Goodall*, Appendix, No. xlvii. from Cotton. Calig. c. i.) The Duke also states, that it was told him by Lethington, that the latter event took place with the Queen's consent, and was designed to cover, by the pardon to be obtained afterwards, all the charges about the King's murder; for *treason* was a greater crime than *murder*!—(*Ib.*) "A fit policy," says the Duke, "for a detestable fact."

† Very different was her conduct in regard to the unfortunate *Chatelard*, who had imprudently secreted himself in her chamber, after receiving attentions from her so particular, as to be offensive to the Nobles attending the Court. After in vain urging Murray to stab him, she caused him to be tried and beheaded; and he died, as Brantome relates, exclaiming, "Adieu, la plus belle, et la plus cruelle Princesse du monde!"—(See Dict. Historique, art. *Chatelard*.) He had become enamoured of her in France, during the life of her husband, "et on pretend," says the editor, "que cette Princesse ne fut pas insensible à ses soupçons."

And indeed we can scarcely judge otherwise, when we know that Bothwell and his *thousand* horsemen [800, *Hume*], passed the preceding night at Hatton, only eight miles from Linlithgow, where the Queen was; she could scarcely, therefore, be ignorant of his designs.—[*Laing's Dissertation*, 29.] “But,” says Whitaker, “is it to be concluded, that because she did not resist she was willing? So might it be inferred that Charles I. suffered willingly on the scaffold.” But he forgets that she was set free again, before she accepted him for a husband, and used her freedom immediately to *choose* him, in preference to all others.

Still there was one who stood in the way of the full accomplishment of his designs. Six months only before the death of Darnley, Bothwell had married the Lady Jean Gordon, sister to the Earl of Huntley. It was necessary, therefore, to make this unfortunate lady accessory to a process of divorce. This also was conducted with as much precipitation as his own trial, and if not with as little credit to the Judges who decided the case, certainly with as little credit to the Earl himself as possible; for the Countess was made to bring *her* accusations *against him*, and to sue for her own divorce from him, on the ground of his having committed *adultery*, *incest*, and I know not what other crimes besides; and as soon as their separation was accomplished, by the sentence of the Civil as well as the Ecclesiastical Courts [see *Hume*], and so as to satisfy both Protestants and Papists, the Queen was released from her state of *captivity* at Dunbar, in order to give her a power of making a *free* choice of *another husband*;\* a freedom which she exercised immediately, by choosing (the immaculate!) Bothwell, who was presently made Duke of Orkney; and on the 15th of May, fourteen weeks only after the death of Darnley, they were married.

These are the *facts* (stripped as much as possible of all adventitious circumstances) which compel us, irresistibly compel us, to decide against Mary. We have been as brief as we could be (whoever is the least conversant with the many histories that have been written upon the subject, will know how much more we could have said), because we wish to look to the *facts* only, as corroborative of all that former writers have alleged against her, to prove that she

\* See the Declaration of the Queen's Liberty (Goodall, ii. 242, No. xc.); rather an extraordinary document for such an advocate of Mary's innocence to produce. See also the Journal of the Queen's Proceedings, No. xcii. called the *pretended* Journal; but, quære,—why so?



was in a great measure the cause of her own misfortunes. It may be said she was betrayed; innocently drawn into the plots of others; defenceless as a female; unsuspecting, from the amiableness of her own disposition; but, if we look to her character, as displayed upon other occasions, these excuses seem to fail her. She had judgment, and wisdom, and penetration enough, not to be so easily betrayed by any body. Bothwell's character\* and circumstances, as a married man, were well enough known, to alarm her innocence. Lady Bothwell's suit alone was sufficient, any virtuous woman might think. A female who could go armed into the field, in pursuit of a band of refractory subjects, and is known to have declared, that she would die sooner than renounce her title of *Queen*, should not have felt defenceless where her virtue and character were both assailed, by the rude attacks of Bothwell, and in the very midst of attendants, who, if called upon,† might have afforded her some help at least. She had married Darnley in defiance of Elizabeth; and surely she might have rejected Bothwell, in defiance of her own Nobles.‡ Lastly, if the amiableness of her own disposition might be supposed to have rendered her unsuspecting of any evil designs in others, she should, at least, have listened to the forewarnings of those who *had* such suspicions, and did not conceal them from her, as her

\* It is curious to read the character of Bothwell, as given by *Conæus*, Mary's great friend and advocate. He describes him as being "*Hominem ad pessima natum, crudelem, vanum, gloriæque quovis facinore appetentem.*"—78. Sir Henry Norris, at this time in embassy at Paris, has the following among his short memorandums, published in Howard's Collection of Letters, &c. "Anno 1567. The Queen of Scots married the vile Bothwell the 15th of May, being created Duke of Orkney the 12th of May, 1567."

† Mad<sup>re</sup>. de Keralio has very impartially taken an account of the different relations of this transaction, and especially of the Queen's own conduct on the occasion, and has come to the conclusion, that a great majority of them are silent as to any resistance, or reproaches, cast upon Bothwell, by Mary. She does not, however, believe that Mary consented, but was entirely governed by circumstances, and unable to extricate herself. She thinks it absurd to suppose she could be enamoured of a man, whom she concludes to have been not less than *sixty* years old; but Lady Bothwell's suit against him, as a ground of divorce, shews that he was not passed the age of *gallantry*. She herself had been married to him only six months before. And Hume has a note, to prove that he was, probably, no more than *thirty* when he married Mary, citing her own instructions to the Bishop of Dunblain, only eight years before (1559), in which she speaks of him as being *then* "very young."—(See vol. v. note H, 8vo. edit. 1797.) This author says, Lady Bothwell had been married two years.

‡ See Laing's references to Birrell's Diary and Crawford's MSS., and his very just remark on Whitaker's cavils.—*Dissertation*, 81, 82.

Catholic friends in England, through both the Melvils,\* Lord Herries (as it is said), the Bishop of Ross, and even Queen Elizabeth, who pointed out to her the loss of character with which such a marriage must be attended; but all in vain. It is true, some of these remonstrances are very much disputed; but there is scarcely any thing left undisputed in this deplorable case.†

It will be asked, perhaps (says Rapin, and we cannot do better than copy his words), “Where is the necessity of clearing this fact in the History of England? I answer, There is an absolute necessity, because, otherwise Queen Elizabeth’s conduct will be either inconceivable or misunderstood. The history, therefore, as well as truth, requires a distinct knowledge of the foundation of Queen Elizabeth’s politics, and of the real cause of the events which will be related hereafter. This fact is as the hinge on which all the affairs of England and Scotland turn for many years;” and soon after, “The knowledge of the affairs in Scotland is so absolutely necessary for understanding the motives of Queen Elizabeth’s conduct and politics, that it is not to be thought strange, that I have given so particular an account of what passed in that kingdom.”

The same author proceeds to weigh and balance the authority of the three principal writers, on whose testimony at that time it was customary to rely, *Camden*, *Buchanan*, and *Melvil*; very fairly drawing the conclusion, that though not one of them is to be implicitly credited, yet that Buchanan and Melvil being contemporaries of the transactions, and eye-witnesses of much that passed, and often agreeing in their accounts without writing in concert, are more to be credited than Camden, who evidently wrote under a strong bias, and probably to please James,‡ who then occupied the English throne, as well as that of Scotland, favoured Mary beyond what the truth would warrant.

\* See the account of Thomas Bishop’s letter from England, addressed to Sir James Melvil, and which the latter shewed to the Queen; but to no other effect, than to afford her an occasion of representing it to the Secretary Lethington, to be a device of his own to ruin Bothwell, and a caution from Lethington himself to Sir James to keep out of the way, or Bothwell would certainly have him killed.—(*Memoirs*, 157.) As this is questioned by Tytler, with most severe strictures upon Melvil’s duplicity and general character, we can only refer to it, as a printed record, which the reader may consult.

† “D’après les témoignages que nous avons concernant les prétendus avis que recut Marie Stuart pour le projet de son mariage avec Bothwell, il est presque impossible de démêler la vérité du mensonge ou de l’erreur. La seule lettre d’Elisabeth est authentique.”—(*Keralio*). In Mary’s answers to Elizabeth, the same author adds, “Elle dit aussi vaguement qu’elle a entendu des bruits à son désavantage (Bothwell’s); mais elle ne s’explique point à cet égard.”

‡ See Bayle, art. *Camden*.

It is well known how many other authors have since written upon the subject, and what a contrariety of opinions an historian of the present day has to contend with in order to arrive at any thing approaching to an absolute certainty; but it has appeared to us, that there are, in the case, some undoubted facts that speak so plainly for themselves, as scarcely to leave room for any mistake; every fact, it is true, may admit of a different explanation, or be referred to different causes;\* but in the case of facts that should *on no account whatever have taken place*, or *been suffered to take place*, causes and explanations cease to be objects of any very curious inquiry. If it be too much to say that Mary and Bothwell should *never* have come together, it cannot be too much to say, that they should not have come together at the *time*, and in the *way* they certainly did. And this is almost as much as we have need to say, in taking a view of the first false steps that led to Mary's ruin. After her marriage with Bothwell her fall indeed was rapid; she suffered mortifications even at the time of her marriage. Few of the Nobility were present. The French Ambassador, Du Croc, though a dependant of the House of Guise, refused to attend. The people manifested no joy, but quite the contrary in the presence of the Queen; and even the minister who had to publish the banns,† had boldly protested against the design.

\* Whoever will be at the pains to read the accounts given by those writers who have been distinguished as Mary's advocates, of the course of events from Mary's visit to the King at Glasgow, to his death, cannot but be struck with the totally different views that may be taken of the same transactions; but what is most horrible in the decision to be made between such opposite statements, in the present instance, is, that those who cannot bring themselves to agree in all that Mary's advocates allege, are left to the sad alternative of pronouncing one of the hardest sentences against her that could be conceived; for, according to the authors alluded to, every step she took was calculated to prove her to be a very paragon of *virtue*, *tenderness*, and *purity*; there is no *Christian grace*, or *moral perfection*, for which she does not obtain credit at their hands, for her advances at this time towards a reconciliation with Darnley, and for her great care about his recovery; merely to suspect the *sincerity* of such appearances is a most painful task, and yet we know not how to join in the declamatory praises advanced on this occasion by others, considering into *whose hands the unhappy King was allowed to fall*. Indeed, one of Mary's warmest defenders, Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, admits, that though the *snares laid for Mary* (for she thinks she was deceived into what she did) were most artfully contrived, yet that, “*la plus legere réflexion et le sentiment de sa dignité pouvoient la garantir, ou du moins la faire sortir triomphante et glorieuse.*”

† Craig.—See a very good account of this worthy minister's conduct and remonstrances in Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio's history, after Spotswood, Knox, and Gilbert Stuart. Hume has given a different but less true account. I doubt, says Keith, if ever there was, before or since, a divorce, and marriage upon a divorce, so scandalous as this.



In a very short time after the ceremony had been performed, Bothwell endeavoured to get the young Prince into his power; but the Earl of Mar, to whom the Queen herself had committed the charge of him, positively refused to give the Prince up to the man, so generally held, though acquitted, to have been the murderer of his father. The Nobles began to perceive that it was already a matter almost of necessity that they should interpose. The best motive they could assign for the measures they contemplated, had been suggested to them by the anxiety shewn by Bothwell to obtain possession of the royal infant. Many no doubt looked farther, but there was reason for endeavouring to keep *the Prince* out of the hands of Bothwell.\* So soon had a change been wrought in the minds of the parties, lately in confederacy, as it was pretended, to stand by each other against all adversaries, that in one month only after this strange marriage, we find the Nobles assembled in the field against Bothwell and the Queen, under all the appearances of military array. An accommodation of differences was attempted by the French Ambassador, *Du Croc*, but in vain.† It was, however, proposed to Mary to dismiss Bothwell as the only security remaining to her, and upon a promise that should certainly have been better kept,‡ she was

\* The Prince happened to be in the hands of one of the most honourable and best of men of those miserable times, the Earl of Mar, who sternly refused to deliver him up to Bothwell, when after the marriage he was required so to do.

† Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio has well described the difference visible in the army of the Queen at this time and when she appeared in the field after her former marriage. “Femme de Henri Darnley, que personne n’aimoit ni ne respectoit, mais dont l’alliance n’étoit pas scandaleuse et déshonorante, elle avoit vu grossir à chaque pas l’armée qui poursuivoit le rebelle Murray. Mais lorsqu’elle appelloit ses sujets au secours du *Duc d’Orkney, son Mari*, ses sommations excitoit un sentiment opposé”—“lorsque le nom odieux de Bothwell, Duc d’Orkney, se faisoit entendre, toute la nation, comme saisie d’horreur, se précipitoit en foule sous les drapeaux des rebelles.”

‡ It is *said*, but not generally admitted, that she had no sooner been brought to Edinburgh, than she bribed a soldier to convey a letter to Bothwell, promising never to forsake him; and that this letter being intercepted, was held, even by Grange of Kircaldy himself, who was inclined to act honourably, to discharge the confederates from the promise they had conditionally made. In the answer of Murray to Mary’s complaint before the Commissioners at York, it is alleged, “that when required to abandon the Earl, she would return no answer but rigorous menacing, on the one part avowing to be revenged on all of them that had shewed themselves in that case, and on the other part, offering to leave, and give over the realm and all, so she might be suffered to possess the murderer of her husband.”—*Goodall*, Appendix, No. xlviii. We do not pretend to vouch for the truth of these allegations; such charges of deceit, falsehood, and forgery, hang suspended over every transaction of this most unpleasant portion of history, that we scarcely know where to stop with any degree of certainty; but of her resolution and persevering attachment to Bothwell, or,

induced to put herself into the hands of the Nobles, and Bothwell fled never more to return. The unhappy Queen had a dismal proof given her of the false step she had taken, in the indignation of the people on her return to Edinburgh. Scarcely any thing can be more melancholy than the relation of this sad event, as it is to be read in Robertson, Gilbert Stuart, Keralio, &c.; but this was only the beginning of sorrows.

Having lost herself so fatally in the esteem of her subjects, and degraded herself in the eyes of foreign Potentates, as was notoriously the case\* [see Hume], it is probable, that the situation of the Prince, immediately suggested the idea of a regency. In the hands of the Protestants, the immediate heir to the crown might be bred up in the Reformed religion, and the Catholics, with all their foreign confederates, disappointed of their hopes, of re-establishing under Mary, in all its force, and all its abuses, the half fallen Romish faith. Had not this great struggle been on foot, and this revolution of things in progress, the Queen might have been forgiven, and might have been entrusted, perhaps, with the guardianship of her own child; but this child was the child of the nation also, and the choice of a guardian, in such critical moments, when by the decision to be made, one party was almost sure to be sacrificed to the feelings and prejudices of the other, became a matter of too great importance,†

at the least, of her determination not to give him up, Throckmorton's account to Elizabeth, seems to deserve as much credit as any document in existence. His letters may be seen in Robertson, dated from Edinburgh, July 18, 1567—"She will by no means," says he, "yield to abandon Bothwell for her husband, nor relinquish him; which matter will do her most harm of all, and hardeneth these Lords to great severity with her." Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio disputes the authority of this letter, but Throckmorton was not a man to be easily deceived. See besides, Lethington's account in Laing's Dissertation, 100, 101, pronounced by Whitaker to be a forgery—but quære? Laing's conclusion on Mary's guilt, from p. 106 to 150, seems to us to be unanswerable.

\* "*Le mariage imprudent de cette Princesse,*" says Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, "*lui avoit aliéné tous les coeurs et repandu sur elle une partie du mepris dont on accabloit Bothwell avec tant de justice.*" As Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio is one of those who think Mary was deceived and betrayed, even to such a degree as to fancy Bothwell really innocent of Darnley's murder, we might ask, whether this is not to charge her with such an imbecility of judgment and character, as might render her unfit to rule a kingdom? But our own opinion is different; we think she was too wise to be deceived, and but too much aware of Bothwell's guilt, to admit of such excuses being available. We think also that she was highly qualified to fill a throne, as far as accomplishments could go; but that no person could be less qualified to rule Scotland well in the then state of Europe.

† It appears from Sir Henry Norris's memorandums before referred to, that at Paris, the Cardinal of Bourbon, the Constable and Dandelot being with the King and Queen, "went about

to be reduced within the ordinary rules of such appointments.\* Bothwell had fled, but he might speedily be recalled, and the Queen, according to very credible accounts, was far from being disposed to give him up; she resisted all the proposals made to her, to be formally divorced from him, and by so acting, plainly discovered, to those who had ventured to suggest such a dissolution of the marriage contract, the danger they would be in, if they suffered her to recover again the full exercise of the supreme power. Under these circumstances she became the prisoner of the party opposed to her. Fresh inquiries were set on foot to discover the murderers of the late King, that the people might believe they were seeking to do justice, when they were certainly only looking to their own security, by finding some plausible pretence for removing the unhappy Queen from the seat of government. It may be presumed, of course, that Mary had fallen into the hands of the most powerful party as things then stood, so that her friends did not dare openly oppose themselves, at that time, to the measures pursuing against her. In what their power consisted remains to this day a matter of great doubt.—See *Robertson*, i. 266.

In the mean while Elizabeth sent Throckmorton, of whom we have already spoken, to remonstrate against the proceedings of the Confederates;† they were to win cunningly the Earl of Murray (being sent for to Scotland) to be of their faction, towards their getting the Prince and his mother into *their* tuition.”—*Howard's Letters*, 331.

\* There was a curious question started, according to Buchanan, before Mary's marriage with Darnley, to this effect. “Whether the Queen, upon her husband's death, might not marry any other man whom she pleased?—Some were of opinion, that a Queen might have the same freedom as people even of the commonalty have: others on the contrary affirmed, that the case was different in reference to *heirs of kingdoms*, where, at one and the same time, an husband was to be taken to a wife, and a King to be given to the people; and that it was far more equitable that *all* the people should provide an husband for *one* young Queen, than that *one* young Queen should choose a King for *all* the people.”—ii. 302.

† Three days only before Murray took upon him the Regency, *Cecil* wrote to Sir Henry Norris: “You shall perceive by the Queen's Majesties letter to you, at this present, how earnestly she is bent in favour of the Queen of Scots; and truly, since the beginning, she hath been greatly offended with the Lords; and howsoever her Majesty might make her profit by bearing with the Lords in this action, yet no counsel can stay her Majesty from manifesting of her misliking of them; so as I think thereby, the French may and will easily catch them, and make their present profit of them, to the damage of England. I think my Lord of Murray will take the office of Regency, and will so band himself with the rest, as he will be out of peril at home.” From this letter we may see, how constantly damage to England was to be expected, if by any affront given in Scotland, the French should be able to increase their party there.—See also the advice said to be given to *Throckmorton* by *Lethington*; *Camden*, p. 96.



evidently of a nature not to please such a stickler for the royal prerogative as Elizabeth was known to be. She must have seen and felt that they were setting a bad example to the subjects of all other states;\* when they would not listen to her remonstrances, nor suffer Throckmorton to have access to Mary,† she is said to have negotiated with the opposite party to rescue her from her prison, but they were too disunited among themselves to be ready for such an undertaking. In the meanwhile, *three*‡ plans are said to have been brought under the consideration of the Confederates, for the adjustment of this sad business. The first, which is attributed to Maitland, was, after punishing the murderers of the King, and dissolving the marriage with Bothwell, providing for the safety of the young Prince, and the security of the Protestant religion, to re-establish the Queen in the possession of her regal authority.—This was a mild and conciliatory plan; but like all other plans of a similar nature, the securities proposed, presented the greatest difficulty—Who were the murderers to be punished? how was the marriage to be dissolved against the Queen's consent? how was the young Prince and the Protestant religion to be secured, against Mary's foreign and domestic adherents, when once she should be restored to supreme power? It should always be recollected, that we are speaking of revolutionary times; there was another struggle on foot, the issue of which might be greatly affected, by the power committed to or withheld from Mary; her situation was dreadful,

\* It is so customary to question Elizabeth's sincerity in all her dealings with Mary, that few will believe that she could at this time, at all wish in reality to help her; and perhaps the truth may be, that though she felt for the indignities to which she was exposed, on the part of her own subjects, the political revolution was one more favourable to the English interests, than any continuance of the former state of things could be. Murray so expresseth himself in a letter to Cecil, in which he seems however under some alarm, as to the real opinion of both the Queen and Cecil himself. The purport of the letter is to remove from the mind of Cecil a false impression he was reported to have conceived, of Murray's being offended, because the Secretary had omitted to call him Regent in a letter addressed to him from the English court. The Regent assures him of the contrary, and prays him not to let any such false reports interrupt their intercourse, *the amity of the two countries being the great object of both*. In this letter, he says of the Queen, "although the Queen your mistress outwardly seem not altogether to allow the present state here, yet doubt I not but her Highness in heart liketh it well enough;" that is as most likely to serve the interests of England, in conjunction with the Protestant party there, for it is to that that he alludes.

† Hume gives Elizabeth credit for sincerity in resenting the affronts put upon Mary, at this time, and for wishing to have her set at liberty; on conditions at least.

‡ Hume says *four*. The difference between the historians is not great.

and truly pitiable, but we can only inquire into the circumstances through which it came at last to be desperate. The second plan was, as violently ferocious and severe, as the former was mild and moderate. It was to bring the Queen immediately to trial, and to have her condemned and punished, as the principal conspirator against the life of her husband, and the safety of her son. Though there were many of the Laity of this opinion, yet it must not be denied, that the Clergy, who had imbibed wrong notions of the principles of regal government, in the school of Geneva, were very vociferous for the adoption of this second plan. The third plan was, to procure the Queen to resign the crown to her son, to have him proclaimed King, and Murray Regent.\* We need scarcely say, since it is already so generally known, that it was this third plan that was adopted; Mary was called upon to sign such an instrument, July 24, 1567, and on the 29th, the royal infant was crowned† (at which ceremony Throckmorton was forbidden to attend), and the Government thenceforth carried on in the name of James VI. In this arrangement the Confederates took credit, for consulting the public safety, without disparagement of the royal blood.

Though it is impossible not to feel for the ill-fated Mary, yet history assures us, that the last expedient had many most respectable supporters.‡ Murray's talents for the administration of affairs had been tried and approved, and Mary had evinced no small ingratitude in dismissing him from the high post he held under her, in the way she had done. It is very customary with that class of writers, who have received the peculiar denomination of the advocates of Mary, to represent Murray as a monster of wickedness and deceit;§ as of the most

\* Herself (says Hume after Keith) to be *banished* either to France or England, with assurances from the Sovereign in whose dominions she should reside, that she should make no attempts to the disturbance of the established government.

† Morton is said to have taken the coronation oath for the infant Sovereign; in which, says *Hume*, a promise to extirpate *heresy* was not forgotten—and so it might have been taken, without much straining; for *Poper*y was become *heresy* in Scotland, at least to the confederate Lords; though we do not wish to say this very seriously, or in any excuse of Morton's act of representation.

‡ Even the Earl of Bedford, a good man, as he is universally described to be, could write thus of Mary at this time to the Earl of Shrewsbury. "The Queen is now content to hear other give her good advice, which of late she could in no wise abide, and can herself also devise and make such *offers*; that is to say, to renounce her title, and commit the government of the Prince to the Lords, and she herself to go abroad into a foreign realm. These she thinketh to be things plausible. July 22, 1567."—*Lodge*, i. 363.

§ It is amusing sometimes to peruse the severe strictures of Catholic writers, on the conduct both of Murray and Elizabeth, *both* bastards in *their* eyes, as it happened, as well as heretics.

uncontrollable ambition, and constantly aiming at the crown, which he never obtained, and which, perhaps, may be said to have been intercepted, for a long time, only by the life of an infant, whom a hundred accidents might have destroyed, but who was preserved through all the vicissitudes of one of the most eventful periods of all history; a period too, marked by some of the most atrocious *removals of obnoxious persons* ever known. We do not mean to say that Murray was no party to the sad events which accelerated Mary's ruin, but we are disposed to think, that he had not influence enough to keep her in the right path, by detaching her from Bothwell; and seeing that the nation was going fast to ruin, through her indiscretions, he kept himself prepared to take the administration again upon him, when called upon so to do, in any emergency that might arise. [Compare Laing's remarks on Paris's confession, vol. ii. 33, 34.] On August the 22d, he may be said to have entered on his high office of Regent.\*

The following passage is from *Conæus*, of whose little book we have already said so much. "Sublata è vivis MARIA Catherinæ filia, ELISABETHA ex adulterino et infando Henrici cum Anna Bolena concubitu procreata, regnum illud invasit, quæ quod nullum à Catholicis principibus justitiæ quippe studiosis ad impietatem suam excusandam speravit auxilium, ad hæreticorum partes, *quos pronos ad omne nefas sciebat*, transiens, crudelius longe Angliam quam *Nothus*, cui regia potestas deerat, Scotiam percussit. Quam nefanda (bone Deus) Principes extra legitimam thorum procreant monstra, quorum eo periculosior est libido, quo potentior; et certè ut multarum gentium testantur annales, spuria et *Nothus* duas præstantissimas S. Romanæ ecclesiæ provincias acerbius vastarunt, quam si universa barbarorum eluvies eas inundasset." With more to the same effect; which, with many *similar* passages in the *copy* from which we have transcribed the above [date 1624], seems to have given such offence to some zealous Protestant, as to be scored through with marks of high indignation.

\* Hume and Robertson have asserted, that Murray, before he took upon him the Regency, had an interview with Mary at Lochleven, where he sharply upbraided her for her conduct, and by the ill-timed severity of his reproaches, threw her into the utmost distress and despair. Dr. Stuart, on the contrary, by reference to a letter of Throckmorton's, not noticed by either of the above authors, though they must have known of it, describes the scene to have been totally different, not however with any more advantage to the character of Murray; for, as is usual, the more *kind* he was, the more is he accused of *deceit* and *treachery*. Hume and Robertson thought to *defend* him by their strictures, by referring his severity to the austerity of his *religious principles*; while those who consider him to have been constantly Mary's bitterest enemy will have it, that having, by *kindness* and *pretended affection*, obtained her confidence, in the acknowledgment of some of the errors and false steps of her past life, he alarmed her so, with regard to her personal safety, as to induce her to *request* him to take the Regency, to preserve her from an ignominious death, though at the expense of her crown and liberty. The



The fate of Bothwell is remarkable ; after various attempts to continue in Scotland until things should become more settled, he took to the sea, became a sort of pirate, until being captured by a Norwegian vessel, he was conveyed to Norway, where, after being, by the extremity of his sufferings and disappointments, deprived of reason, he terminated his wretched life.\*

The Regent soon obtained sufficient credit and authority to carry on the government, in the name of James, with much peace and tranquillity, owing to the disunion of those who might be called the Queen's friends. Robertson is

curious circumstance is, that perhaps her life was really saved by this arrangement, so inveterate were the prejudices against her, both among the Laity and Clergy, after her marriage with Bothwell ; so that the best of the two stories, if rightly interpreted, seems to have had most truth in it.

\* To this short account we cannot omit to add, that after the business at Carberry Hill, or even after the removal of Mary to Lochleven, he might have been taken, had the Lords in confederacy against him chosen it ; but when they found that he afterwards lingered about the Orkneys, and would not quit the kingdom, they sent Grange and Tullibardine after him, with a commission, if they found him, to try him on *the spot*, and have him executed, if they judged him guilty. This certainly must be allowed to intimate a great dread of the secrets he might disclose, if brought back to Edinburgh, against some of those, particularly, who had before acquitted him, and of whose connivance to a certain extent there can be little doubt. Anderson, Hume, and Robertson, have been charged with a wilful omission of this extraordinary commission ; we are therefore the more inclined to mention it, having no desire to screen any of the parties from their share in the horrible transactions that took place ; nor would we deny that Mary was in the hands of persons, many of them so unprincipled, as to have contributed largely to her fall. But she knew who these unprincipled persons were, and should have been on her guard against deceit, instead of affording them more opportunities of betraying her than need to have been the case. Murray, we apprehend, had lost all confidence in her, and all power of preventing her fall ; and foreseeing that he might, in some degree, retrieve matters if she *should* fall, particularly in regard to the church, and the fatal effects of foreign influence, he left things at last to take their course, upon the principle, "*Qui vult decipi, decipiatur*;" if we put *quæ*, perhaps it would express the exact truth. We do not think Murray was the author of the plot, or train of plots, which led to the catastrophe of Mary's abdication of the crown. Scotland had gone on well under both, while Murray was the Queen's Minister ; but as soon as he was *discarded*, and *treated as a rebel*, Mary fell into all kinds of troubles and difficulties, sinking deeper and deeper as Bothwell's influence increased, until her reputed friends almost every where forsook her, for she fell for a time as much into disgrace abroad as at home. Her advocates dwell continually on Murray's retirement from the scene at critical moments, as though he had laid the train, and left it to others to manage the explosion. We conceive that he absented himself at times when, his power being gone, he could do no good in warding off the catastrophe ; keeping within call, nevertheless, to further the views of those who sided with him upon the two great points, of the Reformation, and exclusion of the French, as opportunities should arise.

inclined to think that Elizabeth would have assisted the latter, had they shewn any firmness in the support of their Sovereign; but there was so little vigour and harmony in their councils (to adopt his words), that she was entirely discouraged from espousing their cause.\*

The consent of the Parliament was still wanting to give credit and authority to the Regent's government; hitherto things had proceeded so much in his favour, that he thought himself secure enough to venture to call together the National Assembly of the three Estates. And in truth, every thing was granted that the confederates could demand; Mary's resignation was received and registered; the young King's authority, and Murray's appointment to the Regency, confirmed and acknowledged; and all the statutes in favour of the Protestants passed in 1560, publicly ratified. It was in the month of December that this Parliament met, and it was soon dissolved; nothing seems to have been settled concerning the person of the Queen. It is conjectured, that the confederates had contemplated perpetual imprisonment, in room of the formal trial, condemnation and sentence to which some would have subjected her.

We must now return to the domestic and foreign occurrences of the year 1567; the affairs of *Scotland*, for *this* year, being terminated.

While Mary was ruining herself by imprudent marriages, Elizabeth appears to have been amusing *herself* by the entertainment and encouragement of suits which she probably never meant to accept. Her Parliament had pressed her closely upon the subject of marriage, or in the alternative of not marrying, to declare her heir. To rid herself of the latter difficulty, she seems to have entered much further than she ought to have done into negotiations with foreign Princes, to the embarrassment of her Ministers and little credit to herself.

In the course of the present year (1567), the treaty of marriage with the Archduke Charles of Austria, was renewed,† with greater prospects of a favour-

\* The Duke of Chatelherault was expected from France two months after Murray had become Regent. *Cecil*, writing to Sir Henry Norris, October 2, 1567, says, "The Duke of Chatelherault is at Dieppe, and meaneth within these ten days to be here, as his servants report. I think he shall not be able to annoy the *Lowth* (probably Murray), as he and his, I see, do desire." Which latter passage, I find thus rendered by Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio. "*Je pense qu'il ne sera pas capable d'intimider le puissant, comme je le desire.*" The difference between the original and the translation is considerable, as the reader will perceive; and we cannot forbear adding this one remark, that though this Lady seems to have been a diligent and extensive examiner of our public documents, her translations of English papers are not always to be trusted.

† "There is great reason to believe," says Lodge in his *Illustrations of History*, "that Elizabeth passionately desired to marry this accomplished Prince." If this were really the case, one would

able conclusion than had ever before perhaps been entertained. Count Stolberg came into England, on the part of the Emperor Maximilian, while the Earl of Sussex was dispatched to Germany; a wise and good man,\* and so much bent upon turning the Queen aside from any design of marrying Leicester, with whom he stood upon no good terms, as to be very sincerely in earnest in his endeavours to bring about the match with the Archduke. Camden relates, that Sussex carried with him an associate equally bent upon *preventing* the match; the Lord North, suborned by Leicester to thwart all the purposes of Sussex; while, at home, the Earl himself is stated to have remonstrated in strong terms with the Queen, against *any* foreign marriage.† The sum of his remonstrances may be seen in Camden; who has also given a very fair statement of the difficulties and impediments, started on the score of religion. Seven years had been already consumed, in the entertainment of this marriage treaty, but no

think Lord Sussex's letter to her from Vienna, Oct. 18th, 1567, would have been likely to have determined her, his commendations of the Prince are abundant, whether regarding his person, his mind, or his character among those with whom he lived. "I find," says he, "his whole shape to be good, worthy commendation and liking in all respects, and such as is rarely to be found in such a Prince. His Highness, besides his natural language of Dutch, speaketh very well Spanish and Italian, and as I hear Latin. His dealings with me be very wise; his conversation such, as much contenteth me; he is greatly beloved here of all men; and truly we cannot be so glad there to have him come to us, as they will be sad here to have him go from them, as he is accounted wise, liberal, valiant and of great courage; and (which I most weigh) universally noted to be of such virtue, as he was never spotted or touched with any notable vice or crime." The whole letter is worth reading.—*Lodge*, i. 365.

\* "Wise and loyal as Burghley," says *Lodge*, "without his blind attachment to the monarch; vigilant as Walsingham, but disdaining his low cunning; magnificent as Leicester, but incapable of hypocrisy; and brave as Raleigh, with the piety of a primitive Christian."—*Lodge's Illustrations*, i. 367. where may be seen a long account of this amiable Nobleman; the very man, on whom Lord Burghley seems to have relied, for some wholesome checks upon the ambition and pride of Leicester.

† Lord Sussex seems plainly to allude to this, in one of his letters. "Although the burden the Queen's Majesty layeth now upon me, be greater than I may well bear, yet if I were assured my doings would be well backed there, I durst be the bolder to venture upon my credit here, but when I remember who work in this vineyard; I can hardly hope of a good wine year; and they see the more I go on credit, the greater is my loss."—Camden relates, that Sussex having nothing more frequent in his mouth, than that a foreign Prince was to be preferred before the noblest Englishman, whether a man respect honour, power, or wealth; one, who was of a contrary mind, said merrily in his presence, "when these three, *honour, power, and riches* are respected in *marriage*, the *devil* and the *world* are the *match-makers* and *brokers*."



progress made in the adjustment of the differences upon the point of religion, and the liberty to be granted to the Archduke, of publicly professing the Romish faith, and openly using the services of that church; or if this might not be granted, of doing so more privately. The Queen, who seemed always to reserve *this* point as a plea for breaking off any foreign match she chose not to accept, declined proceeding further, unless the Archduke would repair to England, that she might see him and confer with him personally; but his patience seems to have been exhausted, the treaty was finally broken off this year, and the Archduke soon after married Mary the daughter of Albert fifth Duke of Bavaria.

As the time appeared to be come for the restitution of Calais, according to the terms of the treaty of Cateau, Sir Thomas Smith was commissioned to make the demand;\* a demand which the French were, probably, quite as much prepared constantly to evade, as Elizabeth was to escape from the trammels of marriage. A regular negotiation, however, was entered into between Sir Thomas Smith, on the English part, and the celebrated Chancellor de l'Hospital, on the part of the French. It certainly required all the abilities of this great man to justify the retention of it, in the face of the treaty of *Cateau*; but, in truth, what he alleged did not amount to any thing like a justification—it was altogether evasive;† and had not the policy of Elizabeth led her to be more attentive to the defence of her kingdom from foreign attacks, than to provoke hostilities by the invasion of neighbouring countries, there can be little doubt but that her high spirit would have resented the paltry shufflings of the French Court upon this occasion. The Chancellor was ably answered, before the French Council, by Sir Thomas Smith, but without effect.

In the course of this year great disturbances happened in Ireland, through the restless ambition of the famous Shan O'Niel, of whom we have spoken before. It is not necessary to enter into the particulars of this rebellion, as they may be easily read in Camden, and other historians;‡ the extraordinary

\* The demand was made, first, at the gates of the town, next the sea, in a loud voice, in French, by the sound of a trumpet, and before certain witnesses, as certified by a public notary; afterwards it was demanded of the King.

† See Camden, Rapin, &c.

‡ At this time Ireland was under the government (as Lord Deputy) of the celebrated Sir Henry Sydney, father to Sir Philip Sydney. The Queen could not have a better or more faithful servant. He was nearly related to the Brandon family. King Henry had been his

manners of the Irish Chieftains, their desultory mode of warfare, the strange names by which they were distinguished, entirely superseding their titles, cause the accounts of their movements to resemble more the fictions of romance than true history. In the struggle of this year, however, Shan lost his life. "He was a man," says Camden, "most polluted with murders and adulteries, a very great rioter and glutton, and such a drunkard, that to cool his body, when it was immoderately inflamed with wine and usquebaugh, he would many times be buried in the earth, up to the chin."

In regard to the Continent in general this year, nothing perhaps can be more extraordinary than the information communicated to the Secretary by some of the Queen's foreign Intelligencers (as they were called), of the following confederacy of the chiefest Popish States. It was sent to Cecil, written in the Dutch (or German), as the abstract of a secret contract or league made between the Pope, the Emperor, the King of Spain, the King of Portugal, the Duke of Bavier (Bavaria), the Duke of Savoy, and others, anno 1567. The French King is also stated to have been induced to signify his assent. We can only insert such articles as seem to have a bearing upon the policy of England; omitting, in particular, the several royal marriages to be negotiated among the Confederates, to strengthen the Catholic interests.

"Art. 1. All Lutherans, or Calvinists, or Hugonots, which be against the Church of Rome, shall be rooted out; and in the place of those Potentates others shall be placed at their pleasures.

"Art. 5. The goods of the disobedient Lords and Potentates, which will not consent to be comprehended in the contract, shall be confiscated and seized upon by the said Confederates.

"Art. 7. All well-willers and assisters of the churchmen of Luther and Calvin, shall be displaced, banished, and condemned to death:

"Art. 11. Every man shall be commanded and holden to go to mass, and

godfather, and he had lived with Edward VI. upon terms of singular intimacy and familiarity, which threw him much into the society of Sir John Cheke and Sir William Cecil, with whom he contracted so cordial a friendship, as, in the case of the latter, not only continued to the end of his life, but was of much benefit to him. He married a daughter of Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, Leicester's sister. His government in Ireland was always popular, and at this time particularly so, as may be seen by a letter from Waterford, March 8, 1567, addressed to the Secretary, expressing the great concern and apprehension the people then felt, in consequence of a rumour afloat of his removal.—See *Haynes*, 463.

that on pain of excommunication, correction of the body, or death; or, at the least, loss of goods.

“Art. 12. Calais, and other places lately belonging to the crown of England, shall be delivered to the King of Spain; and he shall help and assist the Queen of Scotland, and restore her to her kingdom, in chasing away the Queen of England; and help to destroy all such as be affectioned, or make claim to the same kingdom.”

The articles, in all, amount to twenty-eight, but the above are most to our purpose. It is stated, in conclusion, that it was chiefly the contrivance of the Cardinals of Lorrain and Granvelle, which may very well be believed.

The Secretary seems constantly to have had his eye as much upon the Church as the State, being indeed unable to withdraw himself from the concerns of either of them, from the multifarious letters and applications he was in the way of receiving, not as Prime Minister,\* a character unknown in the time of Elizabeth, nor yet merely as Secretary of State, but as, it appears to us, the wisest, the most attentive, and most moderate counsellor about the court; one often thwarted, often opposed in his opinions to some of the greatest of the Queen's favourites, often to the Queen herself; but yet whose consummate judgment, prudence, and discretion, were so well known to, and so justly appreciated by Elizabeth, that those who had any doubtful points to carry, or any complaints or suits to prefer, appear to have thought that they could approach the royal ear better through *Cecil*, than by any direct communications. Thus we find Peers of the realm, Archbishops and Bishops, even foreign Princes and foreign Ministers, applying to him upon almost all public occasions, as by far the safest, though not the only channel of communication with her Majesty.† Even Leicester appears to have assumed the appearance, wherever he could, of being upon the best terms with him, and so united with him in certain services of state, as often to have his name associated with that of Cecil, in dispatches and other addresses to the Court.

In the course of this year an attack seems to have been made upon the clergy,

\* Wiquefort, in his work, *sur l'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions*, after observing that *Walsingham* addressed his letters chiefly to *Lord Leicester*, observes, that after Lord Burghley became *Treasurer*, he addressed him also, “bien qu'il n'eust pas la qualité de Premier Ministre et qu'il ne fust pas en effet, sous une Reine, qui gouvernoit, et qui ne se *laissoit point gouverner*.”—Tome ii. 217.

† Cecil seems in this instance to have resembled his great contemporary *Sully*, who was to all persons the channel of communication with his royal master, Henry IV.



by representations to the Queen herself, of an abuse of their revenues and possessions, by long leases and other measures, tending to their own individual advantage; but it seemed to Cecil to be the work of an enemy, and only designed to bring the clergy into disgrace with the Queen, that they might be turned out of their stewardships, and their lands and possessions given as a prey to the complainants. They had proceeded so far as nearly to have persuaded the Queen to appoint a commission of inquiry, when *Cecil* interposed to prevent it, or, at least, delay it as long as he could, that the clergy might not be harassed.

“I am much troubled,” he wrote to the Archbishop, “with the Queen’s Majesty’s earnestness to have certain commissioners in the whole realm, to inquire of the wastes of the clergy, for she is much thereto enticed. I do what I can to delay the execution, fearing that thereby the clergy shall receive great blemish in opinion, and so I mean to defer it if I can.” The clergy, indeed, at this time were very narrowly watched, especially by informers, in order, if possible, to levy contributions upon them, for the slightest breach of the penal laws; and they were dreadfully fleeced besides by the intrusion of laymen into the prebends and benefices, which the Archbishop did his utmost to remedy, but not without incurring much obloquy from persons who should have known better.

In the same letter the Secretary thanks the Archbishop for some support he had given him in endeavouring to allay certain divisions at Cambridge, which had been complained of to him as Chancellor. They had fallen into great disputes there, it would seem, upon the passage in the Creed, relating to our *Saviour’s descent into Hell*. It was judged that the article had been so framed as to leave room for different opinions, asserting only the bare fact, without fixing the mode: so that such disputes being unprofitable,\* were in the Chancellor’s opinion to be restrained, and put an end to as soon as possible.

As another proof of the great variety of things to which the Secretary’s attention was drawn, ecclesiastical as well as civil, we feel called upon to notice a controversy very warmly carried on this year by Dean Nowell, against one Dorman, a Papist, sometime a Fellow of New College, Oxford, who, in 1564, had published a book called the *Proof*; professedly written against Jewel, and designed to *prove* the necessity of *one* head of the Church, who must be, of course, the Pope. This book Dean Nowell undertook to answer, in a treatise, called,

\* He calls it, in his letter, “the unprofitable, rash controversy, newly raised upon the Article of the Descent of Christ into Hell.”

according to the singular quibbling style of those times, a *Reproof of Mr. Dorman's Proof*; which Dorman answered again, calling his defence, a *Disproof of Nowell's Reproof*, and this came out in the year 1565; but in the present year 1567, Nowell made a pretty sharp reply to the *Disproof*, accusing the author of the grossest plagiarism, and of a very unfair and unmannerly style of writing. We need not go into the particulars of this controversy, as Strype has written so largely upon it in his *Annals*;<sup>\*</sup> but we must observe, as a curious circumstance, that amidst all his arduous business and occupations as Secretary of State, *Cecil* found time not only to peruse, but to correct and make additions to the several sheets as they passed through the press. In certain doubts, indeed, upon the subject, we are told that he was particularly consulted, and especially in respect to that part of Nowell's answers which regarded Calvin, who was judged to have written very erroneously against Henry VIII., and the title of *Supreme Head*; a subject certainly not unbefitting the notice of *Cecil*, whose political life we have, in our first volume, shewn to have commenced with a discussion of this very point. Nowell wrote to the Secretary to say, that "he should be bound much to his honour, in case he would (his leisure so serving him) oversee that part; that the printer called upon him, and that he had no cause to stay, but the lack of intelligence of his honour's judgment of that part."

About the same time Jewel also was solicitous to publish his answer to Harding, but would not attempt it without the Secretary's advice; "since he best knew the inclinations of her Majesty's mind," as he expressed himself in a letter dated Sept. 27, 1567. The Secretary it seems procured the Queen herself to read it, who gave the Bishop thanks for it, encouraging him to put it forth without delay.

In Lancashire this year, there was a great attempt on foot to restore Popery. Mass was very commonly said throughout the county; priests harboured; the Book of Common Prayer discarded, with the services fixed and established by law; many churches shut up, and those that were kept open, chiefly supplied by ejected monks and Popish priests. A pretty strong letter upon the subject was sent from the Queen to the Bishop of Chester, in reproof of his negligence and inattention, and the letter was not without effect.

Another northern Bishop, occasioned some trouble at the Court this year, but in quite a different way. This was the Bishop of Carlisle, who with his

<sup>\*</sup> See also his *Life of Archbishop Parker*, *Life of Grindal*, &c.

Chapter, had many complaints to make, of the damage they were sustaining, from the unreasonable leases granted by the former Bishop and Popish prebendaries. One of the prebendaries, Scot, came up on purpose to see the Secretary upon the subject, "who," as Strype says, "was always ready to help the state of the church and religion." The Bishop wrote earnestly to Cecil, by Scot, and Sir Thomas Smith, who held the Deanery at this time, added a letter from himself, praying the Secretary to peruse the paper that Scot brought, and as he thought good, to correct and amend it, and get it signed by his own and the Lords' hands.

We have spoken before of the tricks of Popery, to interrupt or confound, if possible, the progress of the Reformation. And of the indulgences, dispensations, &c. granted by the Pope, to any, who, under an assumed disguise, should mingle with the Protestants, and endeavour to convert them, or to throw them into confusion, or to learn their secrets. In the course of this year, a notorious spy and impostor of this description was happily detected. The man's name was Faithful Cummin, a Dominican friar,\* who at Maidstone in the county of Kent gathered together a congregation, and began to preach extemporaneously, groaning and weeping much, in imitation of some of the Reformed ministers. Several circumstances appearing suspicious in his conduct and manner, he was brought before the Archbishop, who examined him: he acknowledged that he had been ordained by Cardinal Pole, but had fallen off from Rome and become a preacher of the Gospel; but being pressed upon the subject of a license, he confessed that he had none from any of the Reformed Bishops, but referred to his sermons, which were generally against the Pope and Church of Rome.

The fact seems to be, that this Dominican friar, being upon the watch for all opportunities of defaming the Church of England, and fomenting whatever differences he should find subsisting amongst Protestants, had assumed the garb and character of a precisian or puritan; and as some of them had raised objections against King Edward's Prayer-book, and much encouraged extemporaneous prayer and preaching, as proofs of the effusion of the Spirit, he stole into the pulpits wherever he could, at the end of the prayers, and by inveighing against the Pope, and not joining in the public prayers, he passed for a good Gospel minister, but averse from the use of the established Liturgy; thereby evidently doing all he could to exasperate the feelings of the puritanical party against the church.

\* Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, i. 484, 5.—See also Heath's case.—*Collier*, ii. 518.



Sir William Cecil saw plainly into all this, as may appear from one of his memorandums. "In these days," [anno 1567] "men began to speak against the reformed prayers, established first by King Edward VI. and his Parliament, and since by her Majesty and her Parliament; upon which account, divers Papists disguisedly spoke as bitterly against the reformed prayers of the church, as those they called Puritans did."—Cummin underwent an examination in the very presence of the Queen, who is said to have been convinced of his craft by the evasive answers he gave. Finding that his designs were in the way to be detected, after taking an opportunity of recommending *spiritual* prayers, and insidiously pronouncing the established Liturgy to be but the Mass-book translated, he collected some money at the hands of his congregation, and escaped beyond sea; and, finally, coming to Rome, so well explained to the Pope all his devices for breeding confusion among the reformed in England, as to obtain from his Holiness a reward of 2000 ducats.

The kingdom was this year deprived of the services of a very able man, and one of whom, in all probability, the Secretary had a very high opinion, having been his colleague in negotiating the celebrated Treaty of Edinburgh, 1560; and having received from him, when abroad, most important information on the general state of Europe, and secret designs of the several Courts there, particularly the French. This was the celebrated Dr. Nicholas Wotton, Dean of Canterbury and York. He was the fourth son of Sir Robert Wotton, of Boughton Malherb, in Kent, bred up a civilian, and very early employed by Henry VIII. on a mission to Vienna; on which occasion he displayed such abilities, as to fix him, in the diplomatic line, as perhaps one of the ablest negotiators ever known. He was sent ambassador twice to Charles V.; once to Philip of Spain; once to Francis I.; thrice to his son, Henry II.; once to Mary, Queen of Hungary, Governess of the Low Countries; and twice to William, Duke of Cleves. On the accession of Elizabeth he is said to have refused the Primacy. He was about seventy years of age at the time of his death.\* His body was deposited near the tomb of Edward the Black Prince, in Canterbury cathedral.

In that entertaining work, the "Progresses of Queen Elizabeth," by Nichols, it is observed, that the progresses of 1567, and the three following years, are scarcely noticed, except in the entries preserved in the Diary of Lord Burghley. The following are what occur for the year 1567.

\* Strype's Annals, i. ch. 50. Camden, and Lodge's Illustrations, vol. i. 336.

“ Aug. —, the Queen’s Majesty at Windsor.  
— 18, . . . . . at Oatlands.  
— 21, . . . . . at Guildford.  
— 25, . . . . . at Farnham.  
Sept. 9, . . . . . at Windsor.”

In a letter from Sir William to Lord Cobham, May 27, 1567, printed by Haynes, the Secretary seems to intimate that the Queen was to sup with him *privately* on the evening ensuing. “ My Lady Clinton hath underhand procured my wiff to make a supper to-morrow, where she sayth a greater person will be covertly, as she is wont. I meane not to take knolledg, but shall be glad to see hir content with my poverty.”

## CHAP. IX.

1568.

Tenth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign commenced November 17, 1567.

*Various opinions as to what should be done with Mary—Knox—Different religious parties—Mary's escape from Lochleven—Conflict on Langside Hill—Mary flies to Dundrenan Abbey—Goes to Carlisle—Story of the ring—Of the difficult part Elizabeth had to act with regard to Mary—Of Mary's character—Difficulty of deciding what was best to be done with her—Elizabeth's conduct rashly judged by different authors—Lady Jane Grey—Comparison between Elizabeth and her sister Mary—Anne Boleyn—Sonnets, &c. produced at York—Murray's charges against Mary—Mary's letter to Elizabeth—Determination of Elizabeth and her Ministers to keep Mary in England—Sir Henry Norris's letter to Cecil—Letter from Mary to Elizabeth, from Bolton—Extract from the instructions of the Prince of Condé—Of Elizabeth and her Ministers, with regard to Mary—Of Elizabeth and Mary—Sir Ralph Sadler's speech—Of Elizabeth and her Counsellors, especially Lord Burghley—Commissioners meet at York—Queries sent to the Duke of Norfolk—Of the claim of England to a feudal superiority over Scotland—Queries favourable to Mary, suggested by the Council at Hampton Court—Sir Francis Knollys' letter to Elizabeth—Of Mary's situation—Letter from Lord Scrope and Sir F. Knollys concerning her—Of the Papists, in Lancashire especially—See of York vacant—Letter addressed by the Queen's order to Cecil, as Chancellor of Cambridge—Dr. Perne's letter—Queen's illness—Sir John Mason's prayer—Of Mary's case—The Protestants of foreign countries seek the protection of Elizabeth—Many allowed to settle in England—The Pope's bull—Answered by Bishop Jewel—Affairs of the Netherlands—Count of Egmont—Anabaptists—Bishop Grindal—Cecil's Fast—Outrages committed by the Spaniards on the English Merchants' fleet—Paper presented to the Spanish Ambassador—On Fasting and Fish days—Letter from Cecil to the University of Cambridge on Fasting—Queen's Progresses.*

WE are now entering upon a year, the most memorable perhaps in the annals of England and Scotland, as the beginning of Mary's long imprisonment, terminating in an ignominious death, and from the reproach of which, the character of Elizabeth can never now be quite cleared; nor yet as it would seem, that of



her great but not only Minister. We are not willing to impute blame to those who have written upon the subject, with a partial leaning towards Mary, because, as the story is not only commonly told, but generally considered, it is impossible not to feel a considerable bias that way—and for the credit of England, we might surely well wish nothing of the kind had happened. But to take a perfectly just view of the conduct of Princes and Statesmen, we must not look only to the bare result and consequences of things, but to every stage of the proceedings leading to such results and consequences. And we must not suppose that such results were determined upon, whether events should naturally lead to them or not, but we should endeavour to find out, by the closest investigation possible, how they came to pass.

We left Mary in her doleful prison of Lochleven, degraded in the eyes of many of her subjects, to so low a degree, as to render it quite doubtful what should be done with her. We have said that some looked to a perpetual imprisonment; some to a public trial for being accessory to the murder of Darnley; and it must not, for it cannot be denied, that Knox was among those who called loudly for the latter proceeding, being led thereto no doubt, by certain principles of severity, drawn from a school little friendly to royalty, and quite uncompromising on points of strict morality, against which the unhappy Queen was almost universally supposed to have offended largely.

This is not the place to weigh and examine the exact source and original, the justice and propriety of such principles; it is enough to know that they were in very considerable force and operation in Scotland, when the facts that we have related occurred. We may however observe, that the severity of them was probably the greater, from their being taken up, not only in opposition to the Church of Rome, but in places where the corruptions and abuses of that Church had been most notoriously visible. We have shewn in our first volume, how exceedingly gross and corrupt the religion of Scotland was, at the period of the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation, and it may well be thought, from its nearer neighbourhood to Rome, and its connexion with countries that had first felt the weight of Popish Inquisitions, that *Geneva* was not a situation where very moderate feelings would prevail, in its separation from a persecuting and tyrannical Church. It is well known, how much the peace of the Protestant Church, for a long time was disturbed by the collision of the Lutheran and Calvinistic parties; or, as they are often distinguished, the German and Helvetic Reformers. The characteristic of the latter being notoriously, an uncom-

promising rigour and severity, on points where the former thought a greater laxity might be manifested, without offence to the Gospel.

Mary however had certainly fallen in a great degree into such hands as we have been describing, before the opportunity occurred of her passing into England. Her own sex, according to Throckmorton, expressed even greater indignation against her than the men; "The women," says he, "be most furious and impudent against the Queen, and yet the men be mad enough."

It was, as we have seen, in the month of June, 1567, that Mary first entered the prison walls of the castle of Lochleven. There she continued nearly a year, without any visible prospect of relief; even Ambassadors, as we have observed, could not obtain leave to confer with her, and the mother of Murray had her in custody. But there was one, nevertheless, not far from her, who having the heart to serve her, found out the means, though with no ultimate success, as to her relief from bondage. This was George Douglas, her keeper's brother, a youth of eighteen. The story is so well known, from writings of romance as well as from genuine history, that we should think it useless to enter into the particulars, but that the incident as related by Robertson, principally after Keith, is too interesting to be quite passed over. "Mary," he tells us, "employed all her art to gain George Douglas, a youth of eighteen. As her manners were naturally affable and insinuating, she treated him with the most flattering distinction; she even allowed him to entertain the most ambitious hopes, by letting fall some expressions, as if she would choose him for her husband.\* At his age, and in such circumstances, it was impossible to resist such a temptation. He yielded and drew others into the plot. On Sunday the 2d of May,† while his brother sat at supper, and the rest of the family were retired to their devotions, one of his accomplices found means to steal the keys out of his brother's chamber, and opening the gates to the Queen and one of her maids, locked them behind her, and then threw the keys into the lake. Mary ran with precipitation to the boat which was prepared for her, and on reaching the shore was received with the utmost joy, by Douglas, Lord Seaton, and Sir James Hamilton, who with a few attendants, waited for her; she instantly mounted on horseback, and rode full speed towards Niddrie, Lord Seaton's seat, in West Lothian. She

\* Hume says, she went so far as to give him hopes of espousing him, after her marriage with Bothwell should be dissolved on the plea of force; and that she proposed this expedient to the Regent who rejected it.

† Mary seems to have written by stealth to Elizabeth on the 1st of May. See *Haynes*, 464.

arrived there that night without being pursued or interrupted. After halting three hours, she set out for Hamilton; and travelling at the same pace, she reached it next morning.

At Hamilton, an association of many Lords, Bishops, and Gentlemen of distinction, was soon formed to defend her person and authority; inconsistently enough, however, by some who had before signed the counter-association for the support and deference of the King's government; which may serve to shew how very little reliance was to be placed in any confederacy subject to such sudden changes. Murray was in doubt as to the steadiness of many of his adherents, and some indeed did revolt; happening to be at Glasgow at the time, he did not attempt to retire, as some would have persuaded him, but pretended to listen to overtures made by the Queen, till he could get his forces together. Murray's coolness gained him every advantage over his opponents, who were in all instances too confident and impetuous. Hamilton, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, looked to great advantages to himself and family, by having the person of the Queen in his hands, and hoped soon entirely to crush Murray, the ancient enemy of his house. In an imprudent attempt to convey the Queen to the Castle of Dumbarton, they were interrupted by Murray and his party, who had taken their post on an eminence called Langside hill; and the Queen encouraging her generals to give battle, a conflict ensued, so much, and so evidently, to the disadvantage of the latter, through the haste in which they had rushed forward to the engagement, that the Queen, beholding it from a neighbouring hill, entirely lost her courage, and quitting the place in the utmost alarm, never rested till she had reached the Abbey of Dundrenan in Galloway, sixty Scots' miles from the spot where the engagement had taken place. Here it was that she came to the fatal resolution of retiring to England, a resolution indeed not more fatal to her own happiness, than to the credit and reputation of England and her great Queen. For the slur cast upon the latter by all who look only to the moral bearings of the case, will never, we fear, be effectually done away. Those who would endeavour to account for what followed, by a reference to the political situation of the two parties, and the danger in which both Queens stood, from any preponderance of the balance on either side, must be reluctant to proceed, at the hazard of being thought capable of feeling less, than every sensible mind, in *these days*, must feel for the protracted sufferings and violent death of the unfortunate Queen of Scots. The subject is *forced* upon ourselves, by the circumstances in which Lord Burghley



was inevitably placed, as one of the Queen's Council during the whole time, so as scarcely to bear less blame than herself, for the harsh measures adopted. It cannot be denied, that Princes and Statesmen, may, by circumstances, be compelled to act upon information and intelligence, never perhaps *generally* known or understood; and, through this ignorance on the part of the public at large, may seem to act with the most wanton cruelty, when in fact something scarcely less than absolute necessity, and not cruelty, may have been the real motive.

Mary had quitted Lochleven on Sunday the 2d of May, 1568, arrived at Hamilton the next morning; on the 8th, the association in her favour appears to have been fully formed and completed; on the 13th the two armies came into contact, and fought the battle of Langside; and on the 15th, Mary had got beyond the borders, and entered England. Lord Herries, Fleming, and others of her attendants, had, on their knees, implored her not to venture thither, but both her courage and her wisdom seem to have forsaken her on this occasion, and in spite of all their remonstrances, she hired a common fishing-boat, and landed at Wirkington in Cumberland. Lord Herries, at her command, had written to the deputy-governor of Carlisle to know what reception she was likely to meet with, but she never waited for the answer. She hastened to Wirkington, as we have shewn, and was from thence conducted to Carlisle, receiving on the way, as Robertson relates, many marks of respect.

It is generally thought that all this was done, with such an amiable and romantic confidence in the proffered friendship of Elizabeth, as to leave the latter without a chance of escaping from the most disgusting charges of violated friendship, broken pledges, and insidious delusion. Robertson states, that Elizabeth had invited Mary to take refuge in England, and had promised to meet her in person, and to give her such a reception as was due to a Queen and an ally.\*

\* The memorable story of *the ring* has something very questionable in it. From *Camden's* account anybody would think it was sent to Elizabeth *after* the battle of Langside, as a prelude to Mary's reception in England in the character of a fugitive. But from Mary's own letter to Elizabeth in 1582, copied by Camden himself, it appears that the ring was sent before the battle, and that, as Rapin has shewn, in correction of Camden, she entered England before she had any answer from Elizabeth. The state of things besides was materially changed. The ring and the promise of protection, were sent and made before the murder of Darnley, and as it was afterwards alleged, "when she carried herself well, by her miscarriage of herself afterwards, this ground failed."—See *Strype's Annals*, iii. 234, 235. Still however we must maintain, that at the first she *did* receive protection and was treated as a Queen. In short to use the words of Elizabeth's own commission

Queen Elizabeth was certainly not well satisfied with the summary manner in which Mary had been deposed by her subjects, though she might well think, that with regard to an union and perpetual amity between the two kingdoms, there was more chance of friendship under Murray as Regent, than under Mary as Queen;—if Murray therefore were left in possession of the regency, and guardianship of the royal infant, Mary might possibly be invited by Elizabeth to take refuge from the heat of these revolutionary movements in England;\* if her release from Lochleven could by any fair means be accomplished; but the case became very different, when Mary's escape from imprisonment threw her entirely into the hands of the Hamiltons, the declared enemies of Murray. This party, having the Archbishop of St. Andrew's at its head, was decidedly against all amity with England, and much more in the interests of France. Was Mary to be sent back to head this party against Murray and his Protestant adherents, to the ruin and destruction of the friends of England, and in every way to the advancement of the French interests? The Duke of Chatelherault himself was in France four months after Mary's flight, and proposed to come over in the character of the Queen's lieutenant, as Knox, in his usual rough style, wrote to Mr. John Wood, the Regent's Secretary, Sept. 10, 1568. "We look daily," says he, "for the arrival of the Duke and his Frenchmen, sent to restore Satan to his kingdom, in the person of his dearest lieutenant; sent, I say, to repress religion, not from the King of France, but from the Cardinal of Lorraine, in favour of his dearest niece.—Let England take heed, for surely their neighbours' houses are on fire.—Without support we are not able to withstand the force of domestical enemies, much less the puissance of France, the substance of the Pope, and the malice of the house of Guise."—And as Knox then expected, the Duke did soon

to her Ministers at York, "with as much favour and comfort as the hardness of the time, the nature of the place, and other circumstances for the which her subjects pretended their separation from her, and have submitted themselves to the Prince her son, could permit."

\* Hume gives Elizabeth credit for the most generous and friendly feelings towards Mary from the first moment of her captivity, and attributes to Cecil the change that took place in her mind, when it became necessary to decide upon the conduct that should be pursued in regard to the royal fugitive, and to act upon motives of policy, rather than generosity.—If this were so it takes much from the reproaches cast upon the English Queen, while it certainly does not detract from the merit of Cecil, who was to look to the *policy* of the case, and weigh all those important circumstances, affecting the security of Elizabeth, England, and the English crown, on which Hume himself insists. In fact the stake was too important a one, to be lightly considered, as will be seen in the text.

arrive, with a large sum of money raised by the Popish Princes of the continent, and in his retinue two assassins to dispatch Murray; though for some time he escaped the fury of his opponents.

It might have been generous, and certainly quite heroically so, to have returned Mary to Scotland, there to revenge her own wrongs, and further her own purposes, and the purposes of her friends, adverse as they must have been to the interests of England, and of the friends of England in Scotland. Those who look only as we have before said, to the moral bearings of the case, seem almost to have concluded that Elizabeth should have sent her back, with such a powerful force, as might have disarmed all her rebellious subjects, and reinstated her in her full regal authority.\* But Mary had unquestionably not behaved so well to Elizabeth as to deserve this? If *Elizabeth* had been compelled, by any movement amongst her Popish subjects to withdraw from England, into *France* or *Spain*, *Germany*, *Rome*, or even *Scotland*, is it at all reasonable to suppose, from the treatment she received from the Catholic powers, on her accession, that they would have concurred in arming, to reinstate her upon the throne, or that Mary would have foreborne to take advantage of her misfortunes to put the crown of England upon her own head? We cannot bring ourselves to believe that Elizabeth would have found any such favour at the hands of any Catholic Prince in Europe, and least of all from Mary, who had, in defiance of her rights, been persuaded to assume not only the arms, but the very title of Queen of England and Ireland.

Mary, though she might undoubtedly be a just object of commiseration, as having fallen into misfortunes, did not come into England so pure and immaculate as to be an object of unqualified respect. However much her avowed advocates may be disposed to sneer at the virtues and moral character of Elizabeth, we can never get over the facts we have dwelt upon, of Mary's marriage with Bothwell, in defiance of all the imputations upon his character,†

\* Mr. Hallam, in his Constitutional History of England, seems to think that had Elizabeth adopted the most generous plan of restoring Mary, by force of arms, the latter, reigning there "with tarnished honour and diminished power, must have continually depended on the support of England, and become little better than a vassal of its Sovereign." We confess we see not these consequences; the party opposed to Murray, and backed by France, and other Catholic powers, would scarcely have suffered her to reign long under such *ignominious circumstances*.

† This should be attended to, for it may be seen from a note in Cecil's hand published by Anderson, June 8, 1568, that what Elizabeth chiefly alleged against her, while she continued at Carlisle was, that she had not sufficiently attended to "the avenger of the death of her husband,



independently of the murder of Darnley, of which we see no means of clearing him ; while strong suspicions remain against herself.

Again, if Mary were not to be sent back to triumph over her *foes*, was she to be sent back and deliberately put into *their* power ? We have seen, that to the party opposed to her, she had given such offence, or rather so much degraded herself in their eyes, that some had doomed her to perpetual imprisonment, some to trial and condemnation,\* as accessory to the death of her husband.

Was she to be sent to France ?—She might, possibly, have gone there, instead of coming to England, but for reasons known to herself. The Queen Mother was still living, and in power there, and her personal enemy ; with much less provocation and offence, on the part of Mary, than had been offered to Elizabeth.

In truth, she came to England as an asylum, and though she found it a very melancholy, and ultimately a very fatal one, it yet was an asylum, on her *first coming* to it, from troubles and mortifications, without number, awaiting her elsewhere.†

It is an error into which many fall, of considering things which happened in succession, as being all so foreseen, premeditated, and determined upon, as to amount, from the beginning, to a settled plan, from which there could be no chance of deviation ; because Mary, on her resort to England, soon fell into captivity, and continued in captivity for the long space of *eighteen* years,‡ and

and the infamy of marrying a person, known not only as the principal murderer, but also having a lawful wife alive." The remark of the Abbé Millot upon this *single fact* is very just. " Tout donnoit lieu de penser que Marie, esclave de sa passion pour Bothwel, avoit en part à son crime ; sans lui imputer cette barbarie, on ne pouvoit s'empêcher de la croire coupable d'une honteuse foiblesse."—*Elemens d'Histoire d'Angleterre*.

\* Lord Errol, we are reminded by Mary's advocates [*Tytler*, i. 98], offended by the proceedings of the Parliament on Murray's assumption of the Regency, went over to the Hamiltons, to whom he conveyed the information, that the party he quitted had declared, that if they should be " menaced and boisted by the favourers of the Queen, they would send her head to them." We are sorry to say, this was too much in the spirit of those sad times, to be regarded as altogether a vain threat ; and though ultimately, indeed, Elizabeth had to bear the blame of such a bloody sacrifice, yet, at the period of which we are writing, she did well certainly not to deliver Mary to her *foes* in Scotland, as was asked, but refused.

† We would appeal to the advocates of Mary to say, whether Elizabeth might not, probably, have been rid of her for ever, as a competitor, by ungenerously delivering her up to those from whom she had escaped, and to whom it is *thought* Elizabeth was so *partially* devoted.

‡ It is rather singular, but true, that this long term of an *eighteen years' captivity*, was *shorter* by *ten* years than the captivity of one of Mary's fellow-sufferers, of almost equal rank, though

at last fell by the hands of a public executioner, it is judged that Elizabeth had *all these cruel designs* in her mind, from this very time, to the final consummation of Mary's troubles; whereas, considering the eighteen years' continual disquiet she gave to Elizabeth and her Ministers, the wonder is that, in such an age, she should have lived so long. Only fourteen years had elapsed, since the incomparable Lady Jane Grey, for aspiring to the crown of England (though the offence was known to all to be in no manner her own), had been hurried to the scaffold, before she had completed so many years of life, as Mary was kept in confinement; and yet the very rapidity of her fall and execution, seems to have rendered her case, in the estimation of the world, a less crime, or, at the least, a less aggravated crime, than the fall and execution of Mary; but even, upon this comparison, it would seem that the resentments of Elizabeth were by no means so quick or so decisive as those of her sister Mary. The latter has never been half so much detested for her precipitate execution of the perfectly blameless and innocent Lady Jane Grey, as has been the case with Elizabeth, for sparing the life of Mary eighteen years,\* who would unquestionably have dethroned her if she could, who had made *no secret* of her own claims to the crown being superior to those of Elizabeth, and had never regarded the latter as

little known, and little thought of; and certainly, we may add, as undeserving a sufferer, as was ever exposed to such a misfortune. When William, Prince of Orange, in the course of this very year, was cited to appear before the Spanish authorities in the Low Countries, as a rebel (*le chef des rebelles*, they were pleased to call him), his eldest son, Philip William, Count de Buren, only thirteen years of age, was seized, while pursuing his studies at the University of Louvain, and being conveyed to Spain, kept prisoner there for the long space of *twenty-eight* years, during which time his father was assassinated, at the instigation of that monster, Philip II. And yet how little has been heard of this young man, and how much has his hard case been overlooked by historians; to say nothing of the sufferings of his father, thus deprived for ever of the society of the young Prince. This gross act of tyranny, however, made a hero of the injured parent, and terminated in the freedom of the Seven United Provinces; and it is to the glory of Elizabeth, and her great Minister, that they were instrumental in procuring this great triumph over bigotry, tyranny, and persecution.

\* It is thought unfair to look for any excess of tender feelings in those who are bred in a butcher's shop, and yet little less can be said of Elizabeth's own education. The case of her own mother was quite remarkable. On the 1st of May, 1536, she was with the King at Greenwich, dancing happily and merrily, at the jousts, between her brother, Lord Rochford, and Henry Norris; on the 2d, she was imprisoned; on the 15th, tried and condemned; on the 17th, bereft of her brother and friends, who died on the scaffold, and on the 19th executed; the 20th, the King married again, and another was put in possession of her bed and honours.

the *true* Queen of England. We dwell the longer upon this, because we propose to pass over the great point of contention between Mary and her accuser, we mean the letters and sonnets produced before the Commissioners at York. We want no proof of Mary's great imprudence in marrying Bothwell; in our own estimation, the fact speaks for itself; and if the letters, &c. were all forgeries, the proof of their being such does not invalidate or set aside the fact of the marriage, and a previous criminal attachment; for criminal it must have been in *foro conscientiæ*, as they were both married. We are sorry to say these things of Mary, but as her case must for ever remain a blot upon the character of Elizabeth and her Counsellors, we feel that it belongs to this history, to ascertain, as well as we can, the actual *course* of things, that while we deplore, with others, the shocking catastrophe of the story, we may, as much as possible, reduce it to its proper bearings, as an event of the most unfeeling, insidious, intriguing, and revolutionary period of European history.

It is so well known, that in a few months after Mary's arrival in England, her conduct was submitted to the judgment of certain Commissioners appointed by the Queen, upon charges brought against her by Murray, her half-brother, and others of her subjects, that we scarcely think it necessary to dwell upon the particulars of so extraordinary an inquisition. The great object on the part of England, no doubt was, to afford Elizabeth a plea or an excuse for detaining Mary, as unfit to rule any longer in Scotland. If some of the charges against her were forged, we do not wish to palliate the cruelty and wickedness of such gross fictions, we should rather say they were quite unnecessary. She *had* been *deposed*, and perhaps wrongfully deposed; but the more wrongfully, the more danger she would have incurred, had Elizabeth sought to force her back upon her dissatisfied subjects, to the disturbance of the Regency, and the ruin of all the hopes arising from the minority of an infant in the hands of guardians, favourable to England and the Protestant church in both countries.\* But had

\* Having already observed, that we should have proceeded with more confidence in pronouncing the judgment we have been led to form, in regard to the affairs of England and Scotland, during the course of the sixteenth century, could we have foreseen that we should have the support of Mr. Turner in his discussion of the same topics, we may assuredly be excused since he has got the start of us in the *publication* of his history, for availing ourselves of his opinions, while our own work is actually passing through the press; since they serve in many points so strongly to corroborate our own conclusions. The following passage, had we seen it before, might more properly, perhaps, have appeared elsewhere; but it is not too late to introduce it at this point of our history.



Elizabeth, it may be asked, a *right* to interfere so far? Murray had the sanction of the three estates of the realm for the steps he had taken; and though abuses without end have been heaped on the Parliament, as well as on Murray, upon the supposition that the latter was, all through the business, a monster of iniquity, and quite undeserving of such support, he was certainly thereby made the *de facto* Governor of the realm. It was necessary, however, for Elizabeth and her Council to consider what might be the consequences in regard to the safety of England and the reformed church, if Mary were *at large*, especially as there was no saying where else she could be safe. Her party had been beaten in Scotland, and though, upon her return, it might be strengthened by supplies from France, could it be expected that Elizabeth should contribute in such a manner to her own great danger, and perhaps destruction. And as to the adverse party amongst her subjects, her escape from Lochleven had only exasperated their rancour against her, and rendered more manifest the dangers they might incur by consenting to her restoration.

But it is time to notice the events as they occurred. Mary, as we have shewn, arrived in England on the 16th of May, 1568: she appears immediately to have written a long letter to Elizabeth, complaining of the wrongs committed against her, and desiring to be admitted to her presence; the latter, without much prudery, Elizabeth might reasonably enough decline, considering the heavy charges under which Mary lay, and which we cannot bring ourselves to think were without foundation. Robertson gives an exceedingly good account of the

Speaking of the first interference of England, 1559, to prevent the introduction of a French army into Scotland, Mr. Turner observes, "from the preceding facts, taken from the confidential letters and dispatches written at the time of their occurrence, it appears that Elizabeth made no unnecessary, selfish, or wilful interference with the Scottish nation. Its perturbations and conflicts unavoidably involved both herself and her nation in their vortex; and, unless she had possessed the physical power of separating Scotland from her own realm, and of transporting it to the Archipelago or to the Pacific, she could not avoid a precautionary and preservative interposition; but when compelled to intermeddle, her objects and conduct were patriotic and benevolent to both countries, as well as indispensable to the security of her own crown. They were directed to prevent the French from being masters of Scotland, and from extinguishing the Reformation there against the will of its people; and to preserve England and herself, and thereby Protestant Europe, from the calamities and perils which would unavoidably follow, if France and the Pope should succeed in overwhelming and destroying those who in Scotland were opposing their power." As the policy thus commended was the policy of *Cecil*, we have surely a right to transcribe this long passage, especially as affording a proof of two historians totally unconnected and (I am sorry to add) unknown to each other, arriving at exactly the same conclusion.

difficulties which, in every point of view, presented themselves to the consideration of the English Council; but when he says, that “with Elizabeth and her Council, the question was not what was most just and generous, but what was most beneficial to herself and the English nation;” he speaks the truth indeed, but in an ungracious manner. It looks as if there were nothing but an unqualified selfishness at the bottom of all their proceedings; as if, not only all justice and generosity were dismissed from their thoughts, but that they were resolved to adopt the safest plan of imprisoning Mary, in positive *contempt* of all justice and generosity. But we may ask the question, Did they adopt the *safest* plan? Were they running *no hazard* in detaining Mary? Let Mary herself answer this question. In a letter addressed by her to Elizabeth from Carlisle on the 21st of June, she very plainly tells her, that unless she be soon succoured in the way she expects, she shall feel obliged to apply both to her good brother the King of France, and the King of Spain to take up her quarrel; and the letter thus written was sent to Elizabeth by a gentleman who had actually come to her with a special message from Charles IX. However beneficial, therefore, it might be thought by Elizabeth’s Council to support the Protestant party in Scotland, and detain Mary, it could only be done, almost as a case of necessity, and *at an enormous risk*. The main objects, we may safely say, were to secure, if possible, amity between the kingdoms, and the common interest of the two Protestant Churches. In pursuit of these objects, Elizabeth and her Council determined to support the Scotch Protestants against the whole of Catholic Europe, keeping the Queen in England, instead of delivering her up to her exasperated subjects; but, as we shall see, to the perpetual disturbance and annoyance of Elizabeth’s Government, all which might have been avoided by *ungenerously* giving her up to the party from whom she had fled in such alarm after the battle of Langside; and who, in all likelihood, violently, or by trial, would have had her put to death.\* Those who fall as Mary fell, generally sink

\* We are not bound to include Murray in the list of those who would have put her to death, if he could have preserved her life from the vengeance of others; but we doubt of the latter. We have already noticed the *friendly* conversation he is, by *Mary’s advocates*, reported to have held with her at Lochleven, but which *they* represent, particularly Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio, to have been altogether insidious, and we are now desirous of copying a passage in a letter from *Murray* to *Mary*, Aug. 7, 1568, which Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio herself has put among her *pièces justificatives*. “*Madame, Je crois que vous-même ne doutez pas, et tout le monde, peut juger, que si mon intention avoit été d’abrèger vos jours, de la maniere dont les choses ont été depuis un an, je n’aurois, pas manqué de moyens, mais jamais la volonté n’en est entrée dans mon cœur.*”—Notwithstanding the foul and

under a preponderating weight of *enemies*. It is very probable, that had not Mary's *friends* very much at all times outnumbered her enemies, she would never have fallen in the way she did ; but what friends were they ? certainly, if the truth be spoken, *all the enemies* of *Elizabeth* and *England*. It was no very safe undertaking for Elizabeth to venture to become the goaler of such a prisoner, we will not say for eighteen years, for that, we will venture to affirm, was not thought of at this time, but for as many months. This is pretty evident from a letter which Cecil himself received and deciphered from Sir Henry Norris, dated at Paris, July 7th, 1568, that is about sixteen days after Mary had written to Elizabeth the letter referred to above, sending it by a *Frenchman* just come from *France* ; the information conveyed to Cecil, being to the following effect : " The sixth of this present, Right Honourable, about nine of the clock in the morning, I was advertised that one would speak to me, without the town, betwixt Paris and Shalton ; whither if I could come, he would declare that which was of importance, and that touched the Queen's Majesty very near ; which I did perform, and went to him forthwith. And afore I had overtaken him, he finding me coming, sent away two archers which he had in his company, himself being Provost Marshall : who wished I would advertise that the Queen's Majesty did hold the wolf that would devour her, and that it is conspired 'twixt the King of Spain, the Pope, and the French King, that the Queen's Majesty should be destroyed, whereby the Q. of Scots might succeed her Majesty. Here may your Honour further see their fruits whereby the trees are known, and further sayeth that there is an Italian that is much conversant and of chiefest counsell with the Earl of Arundell, as also with the Spanish Ambassador, that being privily taken could disclose much of the treason that is to be wrought against the Queen's Majesty as he sayeth."

He proceeds to make mention of preparations on foot to further such designs, and at last breaks out into the following expression of concern and apprehension. " Surely, under correction of your Honour, considering the great treason pre-

gross invectives with which Murray has been loaded by Mary's advocates ; for our own part we give credit to the sincerity of the above passages : his whole letter is worth reading. Though Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio is pleased to call it "*un modèle d'audace et d'orgueil dans une ame criminelle.*" Such is the force of prejudice. Mary had certainly borne arms against Murray when he tried to save her from one of the false steps she had taken, though he had till then been to her a most useful and faithful Minister. These things ought to be well weighed and considered by those who are likely to be led astray by the boundless declamations of Murray's accusers.



paring by the aforesaid, of God I would wish, that the Queen of Scots were rather re-delivered, than the Queen's Majesty to stand in these perilous terms, both abroad and at home, as this man willed to advertise that she doth." If it should be thought that this information was given merely to compel Elizabeth and her Ministers to give Mary up, and that no such conspiracy really existed, let us hear what the Prince of Condé thought of the designs against Elizabeth only a few months after.

"Le dict Seigneur Prince supplie à sa Majesté vouloir considerer, combien ceste cause (the cause of the Protestants generally) luy est commune, et de particulier interest et de consequence, tant par les ligues et confederations, que les princes papistiques ont avec le pape, pour exterminer les Princes et peuples faisant profession de la vraye religion, (entre lesquels sa Majesté scait que son Roialme a esté le premier persecuté du temps de ses predecesseurs, par les impostures du Pape) que aussi que celluy, qui est *auteur* de toutes les guerres en *France*, c'est le *Cardinal* de *Lorraine* et ses adherents; parce qu'il n'est pas seulement Ennemy de sa Majesté à cause de la haine generale de la Religion, mais encore plus en particulier, pour raison de la *Reine d'Ecosse* sa neice, et a bien montrés par cy devant qu'il ne pretendoit par tant r'establir le papisme en *Engleterre*, comme *du tout faveur* sa dicte Majesté de son roialme, et en investir sa dicte neice; et que comme ce a esté ung moien par lequel il usurpa le gouvernement de la *France* du Temps du Roi Francois II., il tache a se servir de mesme moyen encores à present, du moien du cession de la dicte *Reyne d'Ecosse* à Monsieur frere du Roi du droict qu'elle pretend au Royaulme d'*Angleterre*, dont le *Pape* luy baille la confirmation et investiture, et a despeché à ces fins *Hannibal Rochelyn*; encourt promest exciter tous les Rois et Princes *Papistiques* a luy aider de leurs forces, pour fair valoir son investiture."\*

Goodall, in his inquiry into the murder of King Henry Darnley, seems to treat this as a mere pretence of the Prince of Condé, "in order to induce Elizabeth Queen of England to assist him the more effectually to *usurp the throne of France*, under the *pretext* of setting up the Protestant religion." He adds, that the Prince stated that the Cardinal Lorrain *had prevailed* with his niece to make a cession, and that the Pope had confirmed the gift, &c. This is not quite clear from the paper, but at all events Goodall has no means of discrediting the

\* Haynes, 473, 4, from the instructions of the Prince of Condé, entitled, Instructions baillées par Monseigneur le Prince de Condé au sieur de *Cavaignes*, Conseiller du Roy en sa cour de Parlement de Thoulouse, envoyée de sa part a la Roynie d'*Angleterre*; from a copy signed by *Cavaignes*, and endorsed by Secretary *Cecil*.

story, but by supposing, that the Prince might have got papers to that effect “trumped up,” as his expression is, thinking him quite capable of such forgeries. At the same time those who were *opposed* to the Prince, and to the Protestants in France and Scotland, he seems to consider quite as *incapable* of any thing *bad*.\*

This then is surely sufficient to shew, that Elizabeth, in refusing or declining to re-deliver Mary into the hands of Murray, whom, after her escape from Lochleven, she had a second time opposed with arms, at the head of the Hamiltons, his mortal enemies, detained her as a prisoner at her own peril; not through such *wild* and *wanton caprice*, or such insignificant *female jealousy*, as those who know only the surface of history, have been prone to impute to her. In a letter from Mary to Elizabeth on the 28th of July, she herself speaks, of having at that time, stayed some proceedings of her party in Scotland, as well as of the Kings of *France* and *Spain*, to see first what Elizabeth would do for her; having, in the mean while, as she says, “pour nous entre entendre mieulx, affin que venant au point, ne se trouve difficultay, je lui† ay commandé ecrire à Mayster *Cessille*, tout ce qu’il m’a raporté de par vous (par ce aussi quil dit l’avoir oui de lui de Monsieur de *Lessester*) aveques ma response sur tous les points de sa charge.” This letter was written from Bolton. In it, as usual, she pays Elizabeth a compliment which could scarcely be sincere. “Tout foyes, sur votre parolle, il n’est rien que je n’enterprisse, car je ne doubtai jamais de votre honneur et royalle fidelitay.” It would be most extraordinary, if Mary did really confide in Elizabeth to such a degree; we extract the passage merely to shew, how common such expressions are in letters of that description. It was evidently Mary’s plan to spare Elizabeth, and throw all the blame she could upon her Ministers; of these Ministers, Leicester and *Cecil* seem to be regarded by Mary as the chiefest; others are mentioned, but it will be necessary as we proceed, probably, to make these *severally* accountable for the advice they gave to the Queen; it will then be seen who those were that took the most pains to embarrass matters. Cecil’s great purposes undoubtedly were to guard and protect Elizabeth, her crown and kingdom, and the Protestant interests in all parts of Europe. Leicester’s views might be the same, though prosecuted with a different spirit.

\* Of the information given to *Elizabeth* through the *Provost Marshall*, p. 458, Mr. Turner finds a good deal to say, being disposed to attribute it to no less a person than *Catherine de Medicis*, whose interference proceeded not of course from any love to Elizabeth, or care for *her* person, but purely from her jealousy and dislike of Mary. The case is a curious one, and may deserve consideration.

† The Lord Herries.

But there was scarcely room left, for that *justice* and *generosity*, which Elizabeth is said so grossly to have disregarded. In *strict justice* Mary should have been restored to her kingdom; but how was Elizabeth to restore her? Had she the power of convening afresh the three estates of Scotland, to decide upon the question of her forced resignation; had they not already decided upon it; fully accepted her resignation, and confirmed the Regency, in a Parliament, wherein many of Mary's warmest friends were present? \* Was there any hope, probability, or chance, *at that time*, of any dispassionate discussion of such a question, could the Parliament have been re-assembled? Scotland was already in a state of civil contention; a contention in which it was almost impossible for the Ministers of Elizabeth *not* to take a part; or in short, not to *side with Murray and the Protestants*. The other party had not only the Queen on their side (rather by accident than good will), but at their back, France and Spain and all the Catholic states; had Elizabeth sought to do Mary the *justice* of restoring her to her throne, it must have been not only in conjunction with a party adverse to her restoration, but in opposition to powers with whom she was quite unable to contend, if combined against her. In short there could have been no security to Elizabeth, had she attempted in this way to do Mary justice; but it will of course be said, she did her *great injustice*, by listening to the foul charges of her subjects against her, and by a very partial consideration of her case. Elizabeth was certainly often led to stoop below herself, to save appearances on this arduous occasion. She had high notions of royalty, and hated rebels; she must have known that the more power Mary possessed, the more insecure her own state must be; the abridgment of that power, therefore, must have appeared to give security to herself,

\* There is no portion of history in which it has been more common with writers to *beg the question* (as it has been called), than in the melancholy story of Mary Queen of Scots. With regard to the sanction given by this Parliament to Murray's regency, one of Mary's advocates, concluding that nobody living or *dead* could doubt the *perfidy* of Murray, thus writes, "*à la honte de la nation, cet homme perfide ne trouva qu'obeissance et soumission dans les trois ordres de l'état; les deux chambres donnèrent une sanction absolue à toutes les mesures concertées par lui et ses adherents.*" This is to conclude at once that there could be no sound judgment in these proceedings, and that we are capable of deciding upon those remote events, more correctly than the Scottish legislature of the day. Parliaments may indeed be corrupt and partial in their decisions, but if we are to listen to none but the dissentients to determine this question, our own Revolutionary Parliament that placed the Prince of Orange on the throne of his father-in-law, might be spoken of, by the Jacobites, exactly in the above terms.



though on all occasions, where she could, she wished to cast from her the reproach of supporting rebels in any wilful disobedience to their lawful Sovereign. The adversaries of Mary, therefore, must have appeared to her in two distinct lights; she wished, probably, to have Mary's power abridged, and to have her authority transferred to her son under the regency of a Protestant Lord; but it does not follow that she liked the agents, or was desirous of too openly encouraging them. This led her into inconsistencies, which have a good deal exposed her to the obloquy, and in some instances to the *ridicule*\* of her opponents. The cases to which we allude are so well known, that we need not enlarge upon them: again, in regard to the exercise of *generosity* towards Mary; it may make some difference in our judgment of what ensued, if we allow ourselves to reflect, that though Mary seems to have made a mistake in flying to England, it is almost impossible that she should have made that choice and determination (notwithstanding all that has been written so romantically about rings and pledges) in full assurance, that Elizabeth would do, what every generous mind must feel that she should have done, could it have been reduced to a mere question of friendship, generosity, or sympathy. But Mary, unfortunately, by her recent conduct, had thrown herself a good deal out of the protection of all such moral obligations. It was not in Elizabeth's power, still less in the power of her Ministers and Counsellors, to consider Mary's case as detached from the hazards of *political mischief*. Elizabeth has abundance of foibles, if not faults to answer for, after all that can be said, but having by accident (for so it certainly seems to have been) got Mary into her power at so very critical a moment, her release and liberty, and indeed her treatment generally, became immediately a very perplexed question of policy; she could not be sent back to Scotland, without danger of her life,† or fresh imprisonment; *or else* to join a party *adverse to England*; if left to go where she chose, she might manifestly pass to some place, where her presence alone would be likely to work great ill to Elizabeth, to England, and to the reformed religion; if all persons should be allowed access to her in England, the Catholics were too numerous, and too designing, to be trusted with such opportunities;‡ if admitted to Elizabeth's court and presence,

\* We refer to the reproving of Murray, &c. before the foreign ministers.

† Some in Scotland, as we have shewn, would have had her regularly tried there, and condemned.

‡ Northumberland, who afterwards headed a rebellion in her favour, claimed her as his prize, because she had first landed within his liberty.

how strange would it have appeared to those who believed her guilty of conniving at the death of Darnley, an heir presumptive\* to the English throne, and while his parents, the Earl and Countess of Lennox, were yet imploring vengeance on her head, and that of her guilty husband! There was great danger besides, in admitting Mary so far into the kingdom, a danger strongly insisted on by many eminent statesmen; a circumstance deserving notice, because Elizabeth's refusal to admit her to her presence, has been as usual attributed to much more frivolous causes. "Elizabeth n'étoit point dans la disposition d'appeller à sa cour une princesse si *belle*, si *jeune*, si *intéressante*, et dont la reconnoissance promettoit tant d'avantages à celui qui pourroit embrasser sa cause, et la servir." There may be some truth in the latter, but it points to one of the alleged reasons for apprehending danger. We are obliged to say these things, because even Robertson, with great inconsistency, believing her to be guilty, and not altogether overlooking the difficulties we have stated, still writes, as though she were entitled to the most unqualified respect and compassion, as a persecuted fugitive, properly claiming either to be immediately restored to her authority, or left at liberty to seek aid wherever else she might choose; aid, which to say the least of it, was likely to be immediately directed against England, Elizabeth, and the Protestant Church in both Countries.

The speech made by Sir Ralph Sadler before the Queen in Council upon this great emergency, has some expressions in it so strong, and, if well-founded in all particulars, so much to the purpose, that we cannot forbear transcribing them. The editor of his Papers, Speeches, &c. says of the speech itself indeed, "Sir Ralph Sadler, *like Cecil*, and other Counsellors of Elizabeth, delivers an opinion more reconcilable to *policy*, than to *generosity*, *good faith*, or *magnanimity*." We grant this; but the question still remains, whether, if Elizabeth, or her Counsellors, overlooking or disregarding the *policy* of the case, had resolved to act with the heedless generosity and magnanimity some writers so loudly insist upon, this kingdom would have derived the smallest *security* from the *generosity*, *good faith*, or *magnanimity* of the other States of Europe, having Mary of Scotland in their power?"† There is nothing in the

\* Darnley's title to the crown, was considered, however, to be very questionable.—See MSS. in the possession of the Earl of Westmoreland.

† We cannot forbear observing, that in this comparatively enlightened and civilised age, we have had an instance of an appeal made to the generosity, magnanimity, and compassion of England, by a crowned fugitive, and deposed Sovereign, whom the *policy* of Europe at large

history of the sixteenth century that could lead us to think so ; on the contrary, we believe every advantage possible would have been taken of the imbecility, or supineness of Elizabeth's Ministers, had they advised the Queen to act only on the principle of *generosity*. We verily believe she would have been generous only to her own ruin. But we must advert to the passages in Sir Ralph Sadler's speech, which tend to shew the dangerous position in which Elizabeth was placed at this critical moment. He professes to have come to the resolution, after much consideration, that it could not be good, but rather most dangerous to Elizabeth, that Mary should reign and govern in Scotland ; and he therefore thinks it quite expedient, that she should accept and allow of the regiment established in the young King of Scots ; not to question his title, but to take him for a King *as she finds him*.\* He instances the case of the Emperor Charles V. and the French King, both of whom professed themselves ready to acknowledge the Lady Jane Grey, on the death of Edward VI. ; though the former must have wished to see the Princess Mary, his near relative, on the throne of her ancestors, having a clear title by the laws of England ; and the latter could only be seeking his own security, at the expense of that Princess, and her Austrian connexions. " I have many times," says this sagacious and experienced statesman, " thought of this matter ; and I have considered, so far forth as my poor wit can conceive, of the state and terms which your Majesty standeth in at this present with all Princes abroad, specially with these which be your vicines and neighbours, as with the K. of Spain and the French King, and also with the Queen of Scots and Scotland ; and having entered into the consideration of the same, I find the K. of Spain, and the French King, to be but feigned friends to your Majesty, such as do but expect the time when they may shew themselves open enemies, as if they may prevail in the establishment of their Romish religion within their own dominions ; who seeth not that then they will bend all their forces to establish the like in England ? And if they may then find a Queen in Scotland, that pretendeth a title to the crown of England, who seeth not that she will be a ready and apt instrument to serve both theirs, and also her own turn ?—Where she may have aid thereunto, both by the Pope, the King of Spain, the French King, and also by the favour of seemed to pronounce to be a fit subject for *perpetual imprisonment*. It may be said he had usurped his sovereignty. This was the very charge alleged against Elizabeth, if the *Popish States of Europe* could have got *her* into their power.

\* It was a remark of Knox, in excuse of his not publicly praying for her after her deposition, that the States had deprived her of her power, and they must answer for it.—*McCrie*, vol. ii. 186.



your evil subjects here at home, the Papists, which, to set up their Popish kingdom, would not care to have a murderess and an adulteress \* to reign over

\* These words so openly and unreservedly proclaim Mary's imputed guilt, that it is impossible not to look to the character of the person who uttered them, as well as to the place in which, and the audience before whom, they were spoken. It was then, in the presence of Queen Elizabeth, and before her Council, that Sir Ralph uttered these opprobrious terms against a personage, whom he had known from her infancy. He was a courtier certainly, but no false one, as far as we can learn; he was a brave soldier, as every one knows, and not likely therefore, even in those sad times, to degrade himself so far, as to descend to the low arts of calumny in speaking of such an accomplished woman as Mary Queen of Scots; nor was he a man much likely to be deceived, especially as to the affairs of Scotland.—[See what is said of him, *Haynes*, 558, in the Queen's letter to Lord Sussex.] He was indeed one of the Commissioners appointed by Elizabeth to investigate the case between Mary and her subjects; and who, we may ask, were the others? The Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Sussex, two of the most upright, perhaps, of all the nobility; and yet, what do *they* testify, as to the impressions they received of Mary's guilt?—from her opponents, we grant, but upon the testimony of *facts*. On the 2d of October, 1568, the Duke, writing to the Earl of Pembroke, Lord Leicester, and Sir William Cecil, in the names of his colleagues as well as of himself, declares the case to have been made *manifest* to them, as far as they could perceive; “not forgetting how the upright handling of this cause shall import us both in honour and honesty to the whole world.” (*Goodall*, ii. 154.) To a letter of the 15th of the same month, addressed to *Cecil*, the Duke subjoins the following postscript. “The Queen of Scots, in *respect of herself*, I think, hath better friends of the Regent's side than of her own;” which words *Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio*, after observing that the *postscriptum* to this letter contained, “*exactement ces mots*,” strangely translates as follows: “*Par le respect qu'elle inspire, je pense que la Reine d'Ecosse a plus d'amis du côté du Regent que du sien propre*.”—(iii. 316.) There is, certainly, something very striking in the Duke's remark, and it may well deserve consideration. In fact, Mary's Commissioners, in pressing Murray, Morton, &c. too far, as not clear themselves of the murder of Darnley, accused *Bothwell* also.—(See *Tytler's Inquiry*, ii. 35.) How could Mary be benefited by this? She had boasted of the acquittal of *Bothwell*, and many times declared her assurance of his innocence. If any of the Scottish Commissioners, therefore, were actually concerned with *Bothwell*, it was impossible to suppose they should allow themselves to be so accused, without availing themselves of every opportunity in their power to prove the Queen's too great intimacy with the chief conspirator before the murder; and even, without the letters, this might, assuredly, have been done to a certain extent, but with more privacy. If the letters, therefore, were genuine (a point not yet admitted, though not so disproved as to be given up by the other party), they might have been kept back, had not the Queen's Commissioners provoked the other party to bring them forward.—(See very particularly Murray's Instructions, in *Goodall*, ii. 86.) To shew that Elizabeth's three Commissioners were strongly impressed with a sense of her guilt, Mr. *Turner* refers to the Earl of Sussex's letter to Cecil, October 22, 1568, in *Lodge's Illustrations*; Sir Ralph Sadler's extracts from her letters, and accompanying remarks, *State Papers*, ii. 237; and to Norfolk's letter to the Earl of Pembroke, 12th October, 1568, in *Anderson*, iv. 77.

them?—Marry, I trust your Majesty will so provide, that they shall find no such Queen in Scotland.

“ But, to return where I was, I find, as I sayed, the K. of Spayne and the French King to be but faint and feigned friends,\* which only abide the time to declare themselves open enemies. The Q. of Scotts, also, I find to be a secret deadly enemy to your Majesty, lacking only power and liberty to execute and shew her malice openly; and, for Scotland, I find it is divided in two parts and factions, whereof one is addicte to the young King of Scotland, minding to maintain his state and government, and to continue the religion in Scotland; and they which do shew themselves to be of that party, do offer themselves to adhere to your Highness, and to depend wholly at your devotion. The other party, and faction, do shew themselves addicted to the Q. of Scotts, *seeming* to have an intention and desire to have her restored to her former state and government in Scotland; but *rather*, I think, they mean, under that colour, to advance the House of the Hamiltons, having always been a mortal enmity between the two houses, the *Stewarts* and the Hamiltons, and they which be of this party depend altogether upon France; and with them your rebells also do join themselves, hoping, with such aid as they look for out of France and Flanders, to be able to trouble your state, as well by procurement of a new stir and rebellion within the realm, as by invasions and incursions upon your frontiers, and otherwise; wherein they lack no good will to offend and annoy your Majesty by all the ways and means they can. Thus I find that your Majesty hath many enemies.”

This able statesman then proceeds to consider the means in her Majesty's hands, of thwarting the purposes of these many enemies, considering them regularly one after the other, and suggesting such schemes of policy as were common in those days, and scarcely to be avoided; or rather, indeed, *not to be avoided, but* at the positive risk of having similar practices, adopted with success against the unresisting, and more scrupulous party. Policy indeed bears a bad name, when it is introduced to overrule moral obligations, or violate any of the pure, perfect, and unoffending principles of Christianity; but state policy is,

\* We must not judge of the real temper of the Princes and Potentates of Europe in the sixteenth century, from any of their public professions of friendship. At the very time that Philip II. pretended to be upon the best terms with Elizabeth, and interested for her kingdom, he could sharply reprove the Duke of Alva, for having written friendly of England, calling it *that Perdido y Acabado Reyno*.

on many occasions, rather to be viewed as an extremity to which a nation is brought by the necessity of defending itself against the hostile, not only attacks, but *designs* of other states; for to await the *attacks*, is but to afford time for the forming more powerful confederacies, and more extended hostile alliances.\* The policy recommended by Sir Ralph Sadler is, certainly, that *disturbing* policy, which gives so great offence to certain historians of the times of which we are writing, but which, to those who look very narrowly into the exact circumstances of those times, must appear, we should think, the only policy capable of securing the crown on the head of Elizabeth, her kingdom in any tolerable degree of peace and quietness, or her Protestant subjects in the enjoyment of that religious liberty so lately bestowed upon them.—But to proceed. The sum of Sir Ralph's advice, in regard to foreign enemies, is couched in the following applicable terms:

“ If they have any intention to offend or annoy your Majesty, they have no way so fit nor so proper for them to do it, as by the way of Scotland: keep them out of Scotland, that they set no foot there, and your Majesty shall the less need to care for any offence or annoyance they can do to your Majesty elsewhere; for, your navy being on the sea, they shall not be able to land any where in England, to do any great harm; and, therefore, your Majesty hath specially to foresee and provide that they get no foot nor entry into Scotland; and the way thereto, the best way to meet with the same, is for your Majesty to enter first, to set foot first in Scotland, and there to join with that party which do offer themselves to your Highness for the maintenance of the state and government of the young King of Scots, and for continuance of the religion in Scotland.

“ To conclude, I am of opinion, that it is better for your Majesty to maintain and allow of the title and regiment of the young King, of whom you may have a friend, and by him the amity of Scotland, than to admit the title and government of the Q. of Scots, of whom you shall be sure to have an utter enemy, and by her the enmity of all Scotland; besides the great dangers and perils which, by her, may ensue to your own state and surety; which perils have been so

\* “ The science of politics, if it content itself with devising remedies for immediate danger, instead of acting with preventive foresight, ceases to be a science; it becomes a mere course of expedients, and shifts, and subterfuges, more likely (as all history bears witness) to accelerate the downfall of a state, than to delay it.”—*Quarterly Review of Hallam's Constitutional History of England.*



sufficiently laid before your Majesty by my Lords and others here, that it were superfluous in me to make any further repetition of the same."

Sir Ralph knew, perhaps, more of the state of Scotland, and the history of parties there, from the close of the reign of Henry VIII. than any other Counsellor the Queen could have; in point of age and personal experience, rather more than *Cecil*; having the advantage of him to the amount of thirteen years, but no more: as soon as Cecil arrived at the age of *observation*, he had exactly the same scenes to contemplate, and equal means of acquiring knowledge. These were, then, Sir Ralph's sentiments as expressed and delivered in the Queen's presence; had he so delivered himself *merely* to give countenance to, and encourage, the *vindictive* and *malignant passions of an angry and jealous woman*, surely the history of the times, so largely entered into, would not, upon examination, be found to agree with his opinions, or to corroborate his suspicions and apprehensions of danger to Elizabeth, to England, and the Protestant faith of both realms, should she undertake, on her own authority, to restore Mary to her throne; but we have not the smallest hesitation to say, that we think his view of matters was correct in all its parts; that there is nothing at all exaggerated in what he developes of the mischievous designs entertained against England, and chiefly, if not entirely, by the way of Scotland. Many writers so confuse things, as to suppose, that in the decision taken at this time to put restraint upon Mary, her death, by decapitation, which did not take place until eighteen years afterwards, was fully decided upon; and that, from this moment, the door of mercy was effectually shut against her. We are not prepared to say how much of rancour there might be, at this time, to be found in the breasts of *some* who were opposed to her, especially *among her own subjects*; but bad and cruel as the last act of this sad tragedy must always appear, there is no necessity for anticipating things so far, as to say her death was now as much determined upon as her present detention;\* and after all, we are fully assured her death is to be assigned more to public, than to any private causes whatsoever: but this remains to be shewn. At present we shall only observe, that

\* It is a good remark of the author of *Henry the Great and his Court*, vol. i. 77. that "those who produce details after an event, are in the habit of connecting circumstances as if they had all been purposely foreseen and arranged. It is, however, a known fact, that in the progress of the most perfect combination, circumstances will always intervene which are merely the result of chance, and the work of a moment." Mary's flight into England, against the advice of those who accompanied her, could not be the result of any English combinations.

from the speech above, as well as from some circumstances that took place before the Commissioners at York and in London, relative to the guilt of Mary, Elizabeth was rather backward than otherwise to treat her as she was treated. In a part of the speech already referred to, Sir Ralph absolutely urges the Queen to consider, that if she proceed "*coldly and indifferently* shewing herself indifferent betwixt both parties, *as she had hitherto done*—it would inevitably be a great hindrance and prejudice, both to her Majesty, and to that party which was ready to stand for her Majesty, and the young King of Scots."

We are not in the least anxious to defend Elizabeth or any of her Counsellors, beyond what the exact circumstances of the case may warrant; we are merely led, in justice to the celebrated subject of this Memoir, and to the extraordinary Sovereign he served, to ascertain as nearly as we can, what were the exact causes which from the beginning of Mary's troubles, induced Elizabeth and her Ministers to pursue the course they did pursue; at the hazard of bringing no small disgrace on the country for ages to come—a country which in all other respects is indebted to them, for the highest degree of glory and renown—at all events we are desirous of shewing that Lord Burghley was very far from being *exclusively* responsible for the part that was taken, though we cannot for a moment doubt, that he was among those, who regarded Mary as a deadly enemy to Elizabeth, and to the best interests of his country, and could never bring himself to trust to such proffered securities as were at different times propounded for her enlargement.\* But that her imprisonment for life in

\* There was one great security wanting in all negotiations with Mary; and that was a security against her own fixed principles of religion.—Elizabeth will never be forgiven for the disturbances in Scotland, as an interference with the government of an independent Sovereign—and yet good *policy* must have pointed out to her the danger of having Scotland united against her; but Mary had *always* a *religious* motive at hand for disturbing *Elizabeth's* government. The following being a decree of the Council of Lateran, confirmed by that of Trent, so recently concluded, and to the decrees of which Mary had vowed obedience.

"If temporal governors being required and admonished by *the Church*, shall neglect to purge *heresy* out of the country, let this be signified to the *Pope*, and from henceforth he may declare their subjects free from their allegiance, and give away their lands to be possessed by *Catholics*." Surely it must be granted, that Elizabeth had not only received but slighted the admonition of the Pope, and thereby incurred the penalty of disobedience; and if the Catholics might thereupon seize the "*lands*" of her Protestant subjects, it is well known that Mary of all people in the world must have been judged entitled to seize her *crown*.

*England*, much less her death by the hands of the executioner, as the termination of *such imprisonment*, were not thought of, when in the autumn of this year the several Commissioners met at York, to discuss the charges of the King of Scots' party against Mary, *and her charges against them*, seems very clear from the following queries, taken from a minute of the Secretary, dated Oct. 16, and sent to the Duke of Norfolk, the Queen's first Commissioner.

"Whether if the Queen (of Scots) be found guilty, she may not be by some provisions restored to Scotland with surety of her life, and to live either as a Queen in name only, with her son continuing King; or as a dowager? And what kind of sureties may be given by the Earl of Murray and his party to the Queen's Majesty for observation hereof?

"In what sort may the Duke of Chatelherault be reconciled, to allow of the government of Scotland in case the Queen be found guilty? and how may he be a partaker of the government and *drawn from the devotion of France*?

"What is the opinion there for the title of the crown of Scotland, if the Prince should die, and the Queen also without farther issue, to whom it should come?

"If the Queen remain in England being found guilty, what allowance will Scotland yield for her maintenance?

"If the Queen be not found guilty, in what sort may the Prince and his adherents be assured to live? and what kind of government shall be thought meet to either party? If England should maintain the government of Scotland, what alliance and aid might England have against the common enemy?"

The first day that the Commissioners met at York was on the 4th of October 1568. The above questions are dated on the 16th, twelve days after, but in the interim, on the fifth session of the Commissioners, October the 8th, Murray had expressed a great desire to be certified as to the consequences of their proving the Queen guilty, it being generally reported in Scotland and at York, that she was to be "amply, or at least, partially restored by Elizabeth, and *it might be to their great danger*."

In the meanwhile Elizabeth has for nothing been more censured, than for allowing the *rebel* Murray to put such preliminary and *impertinent* questions—but it seems to be quite forgotten what character Murray really sustained in the business.—Neither Elizabeth nor her Council had any real right to call him from the seat of government in Scotland, to answer for what had passed. Right or wrong, the young King had been crowned, and Murray acknowledged



as Regent by the three Estates. [See the list of papers delivered to Elizabeth's Commissioners, *Goodall*, ii. 87.] He needed indeed the amity and support of Elizabeth, and both might have been yielded to him, on political grounds, without further inquiries; Mary might have been protected and entertained in England, till things should change in Scotland; but Elizabeth having, at *Mary's request*,\* required some reason to be assigned by her adversaries for their removal of her, Murray himself came to answer the inquiry, not as a *rebel*, but as Regent. Mary called him a *rebel*, and censured Elizabeth for admitting him to her presence as *such*, she herself being excluded; but the cases were very different.—Murray was so hated by Elizabeth's Catholic subjects, that he could scarcely venture so far into the kingdom without *danger* to himself; Mary was so popular with them, notwithstanding her imprudences in Scotland, as to be likely to excite danger to Elizabeth's government wherever she came. And as to Murray's being allowed to return, while Mary was detained; it was a case of great hazard to Elizabeth and to England, that as Regent he should be absent from Scotland at such a time, while Mary could not be set at large immediately, without extreme risk to the *Protestant* governments of both countries. At the request of the English government, Murray had *suspended hostilities* with the Queen's party till the case could be heard in England, but nearly to his ruin, for Mary having made Argyle and Huntley her lieutenants (and the Duke of Chatellherault, if he came in time, chief in command), they immediately levied their forces, and threatening to destroy the Regent and all his party with fire and sword, had nearly come upon them by *surprise*, and seized the King.—See letter from Cecil to Sir Henry Norris, August 27, 1568. Cabala 152.—This may serve to shew how hazardous it was, for Murray to be absent or off his guard, if he wished to avoid surprise, after having on *his* part agreed to a suspension of hostilities. The inquiries therefore sent to the Duke of Norfolk, and of which we have spoken, seem clearly to shew, that even if Mary should be proved guilty, the English government wished to devise means of sending her back out of England; or if she should remain in the latter country, to make it the act of the Scots themselves, by obliging them to provide for her maintenance; or finally, if found not guilty, then to restore her upon the best conditions and securities they could devise for the King and his party. All this was natural enough, and we should say sufficiently impartial, even if Elizabeth were to act as *Judge* in the case; but this could only have been admitted either by Mary, or Murray

\* See the commission to the Duke of Norfolk Earl of Sussex, and Sir R. Sadler.—*Goodall*, ii. 95.

as Regent, on the footing of the pretence set up by England, of a *feudal superiority* over Scotland,\* which was constantly denied. Just before the ease was adjourned from York to London, other queries appear to have been suggested in a meeting of the Councel at Hampton Court, favourable to Mary, and which probably proceeded from *Cecil*; queries being his common mode of suggesting what might be most proper. Thus in the account of this meeting, Oct. 30, 1568, present the Lord Keeper, Lord Stuart, Earl of Leicester, the Lord Admiral, the Lord Chamberlain, Sir William Ceeil, and Sir Ralph Sadler, we find the following queries subjoined.

“ 1. If the Queen of Scots will not grant comission to have her cause fully heard, what shall be done ?

“ 2. If she will have it heard, whether shall she not personally understand wherewith she is charged ? and if any of the states of the realm, that shall be

\* We have had occasion to speak of this claim in our first volume ; it was certainly insisted upon by Elizabeth's Commissioners at York, on this occasion.—See the commission itself, Goodall, 97. vol. ii. and the protestations of the two Queens, *ib.* Nos. xxxvii. xxxviii.—Under Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, it seems to have been advanced as a counterpoise, to the *ancient alliance* between Scotland and France, so much insisted upon by the latter, as a ground for their constant interference to support Scotland *against England*. It appears however to have been regarded by both parties as a question in abeyance, at this time, from the following passage in the Duke of Norfolk's letter to Elizabeth, York 9, 1568. “ Whereupon to meet their protestation,” (Goodall, No. xxxvii.) “ we thought good to protest again immediately,” (No. xxxviii.) “ and so we passed over the matter with them in merry and pleasant speeches, not yielding to their opinion, nor they to ours, touching the matter contained in our said protestation.”—*Goodall*, ii. 134. It seems to have been a common case in all treaties to leave such claims unsettled—thus the English claim to the crown of France, was *allowed* to continue upon its old footing, in many treaties with that country, and when the Princess Mary, sister of Henry VIII. was married to Lewis XII. of France, the latter did not scruple to admit the *Fleurs-de-lys*, or French arms, into *her* escutcheon.—See *Guillim*, and *Heraldic Anomalies*, 2d edition. This may be some answer to those, who judge Elizabeth's pretence to the throne of France to have been a fair excuse for Mary's assumption of the arms and title of England. The case was quite different, Mary's friends and family considered hers to be a *direct claim* against Elizabeth ; the English claim to the French crown, would have been a good one but for the *Salic Law* ; so long therefore as that law or custom continued valid in France itself, it was in vain to insist upon it *there* ; yet it was allowed by the French themselves to have a good *hereditary* foundation—and it may almost be questioned whether the claim were not regarded as a compliment by France, while in *compliance* with the *Salic Law*, as a national regulation, it was considered, as to the *actual occupation* of the *throne*, to be a *suspended*, though a good family pretension.—At all events the French never insisted in their treaties, upon the relinquishment even of the title, as Throckmorton noticed, upon Mary's assumption of the English title and arms.

called to hear the matter, shall require to hear herself speak and answer, whether they shall be thereto permitted?

“It were meet in this cause to have some form observed of the proceeding, by some expert person in the civil law.”

Whoever penned these queries, with the remark at the end, could scarcely intend to proceed by any very irregular process.\* Though they seem to have been overruled; at least as to Mary's personal appearance to answer to the charges brought against her; it was proposed, instead, to send special Commissioners to her to receive her answer.—Mary's Commissioners, it should be observed, in their mistress's name, refused to make any answer, unless she were admitted to the Queen's presence.—Elizabeth's reply, indorsed by Cecil, may be seen in Haynes, 494, in which other modes are suggested to Mary, of replying to the charges brought against her.

Another remarkable circumstance is to be gathered from a letter of the Vice-Chamberlain, Sir Francis Knollys, to the Queen, from Bolton, Jan. 1, 1568-9, in which he plainly represents to Elizabeth, that he and Lord Scroope, could make but little impression upon Mary, in persuading her to agree to a proposition they were directed to lay before her, unless her Majesty would act with somewhat more decision *against her*. He concludes his letter thus;

“And to be plain with your Majesty, it seems that this Queen is half persuaded (that is, by her minister the Bishop of Ross), that God hath given you such temperation of affections, that your Majesty will not *openly disgrace* her,† nor forcibly maintain my Lord of Murray against her, howsoever she refuse to yield to your Majesty's conformity.”‡

Knollys had been commissioned [Haynes, 497,] to make to Mary the following

\* Cecil's replies to Murray's proposals to Elizabeth, 22 June, 1568, have in them something very reasonable, though we shall be told, as usual, that it was all deceit. To his first objection “They would be loth to enter first into an accusation of the Queen, and then after that to enter into a qualification;” Cecil answers, “The Queen's Majesty never meant to have any to come to make any *accusation* of the Queen, but meaning to have some good end to grow betwixt the Queen and her subjects, was content to *hear* any thing they had to say for themselves;” and again, “the Queen's Majesty never meaneth so to deal in the cause, as to proceed to any condemnation of the Queen of Scots.”—And in fact, she did pass no judgment upon the case.

† This deserves attention, as it affords a clue to some part of the proceedings at York.

‡ From this letter of Sir Francis Knollys, it appears that Mary had at that time the power of communicating with her uncle the Cardinal of Lorraine; and of the way in which she passed her time (that is, literally, of her *pastimes*, as they were called), at Carlisle and Bolton, a curious account may be seen in Chalmers and Turner, from Knollys' letters.



proposals.—That in the way of *permission*,\* and as of her *own* will, she should allow her son to continue in the state wherein he then was, and the regiment in the Earl of Murray, as already ordered by the Scottish Parliament, and herself to continue in England, and her son to be brought thither to be educated by natives of Scotland, and all that had passed to be buried in oblivion.—As to his own opinion, on the 20th of October, he thus writes to *Cecil*, inclosing the copy of a letter he had sent to the Duke of Norfolk. “What is fit for her Majesty to do, passeth my capacity to give counsell, the circumstances that have passed are so diverse. All things considered, I see not how her Majesty can with honour and safety detain this Queen, unless she be *utterly disgraced* to the world, and that contrary party be thoroughly maintained. Again I see not how her Majesty can safely make a reconciliation, and set her in her seat with the aid of a fixed council or otherwise, unless all foreign practices may be avoided by an English marriage.”

To bring our account of the affairs of Scotland to some conclusion for this year, we should say, that the arrival of Mary in England, presented to Elizabeth and her Ministers, one of the most perplexed cases of policy that could possibly have been conceived. All that went against Mary in Scotland, was favourable to England; all that had occurred in her favour, on her escape from Lochleven, unfavourable, not only as far as regarded the enmity between the houses of Hamilton and Murray, but in regard to the connexion of the former, at so momentous a period, with France. If Mary were to be forced back upon those who had deposed her, and her life secured by an armed interposition, Elizabeth must have taken part against her best allies in Scotland, and weakened the Protestant cause; while the young Prince, who might and did come to inherit the English throne, would have been taken out of the hands of the Protestants, who then had him in

\* This is sufficient to shew that Elizabeth did not seek, as some have again and again asserted, to take advantage of Mary's forced resignation of her authority at Lochleven. Mary indeed told Knollys, that Elizabeth had declared to the Bishop of Ross, that “she would have her a Queen still, and that Murray should take the execution of the government at the hands of *her* and of her son jointly.” Though Knollys seemed to doubt the Bishop's report, or at all events to think the Queen had gone too far if it were true; we are disposed to think Elizabeth might have so expressed herself, and would have been glad if Mary could have been brought to accede to such proposals.—See *Haynes*, 498. Every step taken by Elizabeth is so sure to be branded by Mary's advocates, as in the highest degree deceitful, that we have not dwelt upon the fact of her Minister in Scotland being *forbidden* to attend the coronation of James. It certainly does appear from the above letter of Knollys, compared with the one before cited, that Elizabeth had some reluctance to the *open* and *utter* disgrace of Mary, if it could possibly be avoided.

their power to instruct and educate, and thrown into the hands of Papists, and some of the greatest foes with whom England had to contend. If Mary were restored to her own party, France was at hand (not to mention Spain and the Pope) to support her cause, and assist her in prosecuting her resentments against the Protestants, and against England, as the main support of that party. If her adversaries brought against her *false* charges, and supported them with *forged* documents, it was certainly most atrocious; but from all we have read upon the subject, we are not prepared to say that this was absolutely and entirely the case; certainly the innocence of Mary was not so proved as it might have been,\* if she would have consented to *any mode* of answering the charges against her, but *that* which she knew to be proscribed, namely, a personal interview with Elizabeth.† During this year, though not at liberty, she was not under any very great restraint; she had free communication with her friends in Scotland, her relatives in France, and with Spain and Rome; and she had her Minister in England, and a large retinue of servants and attendants, considering her situation. She was in the custody of a Peer of the realm, and treated with considerable respect; indeed both Lord Scroope and Knollys seem to have been fascinated with her manners, on their first interview with her after her arrival at Carlisle. “We found her in her answers,” they write to Elizabeth, May 29, 1568, “to have an eloquent tongue and a discreet head; and it seemeth by her doings, that she hath stout courage and liberal heart adjoined thereunto.”‡

It is melancholy to think that all Mary's personal accomplishments, only

\* The following note of Mr. Turner's, published since the above was written, is too important to be omitted.—“As I have resolved not to build this history from any doubtful or disputed materials, I have not used these letters in the construction of my narrative, but it may be right to add, that after attentively considering all that the Queen's zealous advocates have argued rather than judged in their favour, I am not induced to depart from the concurring opinions of Mr. Hume, Dr. Robertson, Lord Hailes, and Malcolm Laing, nor from the much earlier conviction of the statesmen and general public, both in Scotland and England, at the time of their production, that they were the genuine compositions of this Royal Lady: and if genuine, they not only prove her criminal intimacy with Bothwell, but they also shew that she went to cajole Darnley to Edinburgh; and they contain some allusions which incline the mind to believe that she was not ignorant that Bothwell and Maitland were concerting or preparing for the violent removal of her husband.”—*Turner's Hist. of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. ii. p. 99.

† See how this is insisted upon in many papers in Goodall's Appendix, and in what terms Elizabeth's refusal to admit her was approved, even by the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, &c. &c.—p. 260. No. xcv. See also No. xcvi. and examine xcvi. 264. and No. c. by Cecil, p. 269.

‡ See some other letters from the same, in the first series of Mr. Ellis's Collection, vol. ii.

tended to increase the danger of setting her free, in the then state of Christendom, from the difficulty they occasioned of framing any adequate securities, for the maintenance of the English crown on the head of Elizabeth, and for the upholding of the cause of Protestantism throughout the whole island of Britain. We may easily conjecture, how fatal to these several interests, the "*eloquent tongue*," the "*discreet head*," the "*stout courage*," and the "*liberal heart*," of Mary might have been, at the head of any of the parties then opposed to those interests,\* or at the head, perhaps, of *all those parties* combined, in the bond of the *Holy League*. This letter from Lord Scroope and Sir Francis Knollys (May 29, 1569) deserves particular attention. They seem to have been perfectly embarrassed as to any advice they could give to Elizabeth; the detention or release of Mary, appear to them to have been equally fraught with danger to the person as well as to the crown of the former. If detained without being convicted of conniving at least, at the murder of Darnley, they had already perceived, that she had such a power of setting forth her own innocence, and blackening the characters of those opposed to her, that she would soon make friends in the North of England, where she then was, to the disturbance of that part of the kingdom; and if carried more southward, a still more extensive rising in her favour might be expected, among her Catholic friends and adherents. They submit to Elizabeth the expedient of leaving it to her own choice, to return to Scotland, or abide in England; but immediately add their own distrust of the security of any such expedient, in the following striking terms. (*Goodall*, ii. 72.) —“And yet I think it is likely that if she had so her own choice, she would not go back into her own realm presently, nor until she might look for succours of men out of France to join with her there, or if she would go presently into her own country, the worst were, peradventure, with danger enough, she might get into France; and that would hardly be done, if my Lord of Murray have a former inkling of her departure thither; and on the other side, she cannot be kept so rigorously as a prisoner with your Highness' honour (in mine opinion), but with devices of towels or toys at her chamber-window or elsewhere, in the night a body of her agility and spirit may escape soon, being so near the border; and surely to have her carried further into the realm, is the high way to a dangerous sedition, as I suppose.” The danger to be apprehended was not from Mary individually, but from the strong hold she had upon all Elizabeth's adversaries,

\* See Camden, 110. His account of the dangers to be apprehended is very good.



whether left to her own choice, or detained against her will, and the moral certainty there was of her seeking the aid of such adversaries, if not kept under some restraint ; but the alternative of such restraint was not so free from danger to Elizabeth, as to be adopted upon any such frivolous motives or feelings, as are usually ascribed to our English Sovereign. As to the utter *disgrace* of Mary, according to Sir F. Knollys' letter, which from the careless manner of expression, might seem to be suggested, for the mere purpose of supplying a *handle* or *pretence* for her detention, how could it be expected to save Elizabeth's *honour*, if recourse were to be had only to *forgeries* ? In this very letter Knollys calls the charges against Mary as exhibited at York, "*odious accusations*," but he does not pronounce them to be *false* ; on the contrary, he seems to intimate, that there was no other alternative, than either to *suppress* them, or *bring* them forward as maintainable against Mary—and he speaks of this as the opinion of the Commissioners at York, the Duke of Norfolk particularly. It is surprising how differently the same transactions may be interpreted by different persons.—It would look in one point of view, as though Elizabeth, so far from wishing *utterly to disgrace* Mary, as a plea for her detention, needed to be strongly moved to do so ; and as there was at first a sort of *hushing up* of the "*odious accusations*," which were afterwards more openly published, we have almost a right to conclude, that her *utter degradation* was not much countenanced by Elizabeth ; and only forced upon her by circumstances. England was offered as an asylum to Mary as an undegraded Queen, upon her voluntary acknowledgment of the government of her son ; but if she would enter into no such terms, the charges against her were judged by Knollys and others, to be the only adequate excuses for not setting her free. Sufficient excuses they could only be after all, upon the ground of necessity and self-preservation, which as Lord Bolingbroke has said, are in political as well as other emergencies, the great laws of *nature*.—*Diss. on Parties*, 130. See also p. 128.

Elizabeth was judged so much inferior to Mary, in all the softer and more elegant accomplishments of the female sex, that many, no doubt, will *constantly* and *for ever* be inclined to *wish*, that the balance had taken a different turn, but the historian may not be allowed to look at things in this point of view. *Vita Mariæ, Mors Elizabethæ ; Vita Elizabethæ, Mors Mariæ* ;\* appears to have

\* An expression of those times, evidently borrowed from the reply of Clement IV. to Charles of Anjou, when the latter consulted him as to the unhappy Corradine, nephew of his rival Manfred. "*Vita Corradini, Mors Caroli ; Mors Corradini, Vita Caroli*."

been but too truly the alternative presented to the attention of the politicians on both sides ; and though nothing of this kind can amount to a satisfactory justification in our own days of the steps taken against Mary, yet so many other things were connected with the life or death of either Queen, at the period in question, that thither, and thither only,\* should we look for a solution of the difficulties of this great national emergency ; an emergency, aggravated and increased every succeeding year by Mary's detention, and which could not therefore be altogether the effect of mere female jealousy and caprice. The *Statesmen* of England, at all events, had much more serious and important objects to attend to.

It was found necessary to look narrowly into the proceedings of the Papists this year, particularly in Lancashire, and other parts of the diocese of Chester. The Bishop of that see, requiring some stimulus, as it would appear, to act against them with sufficient rigour ; rather, indeed, to execute more fully and effectually the Queen's commission ; many appearing to have been encouraged by his slackness to enter into dangerous associations, for the upholding the Mass and Popery, in contempt of the Church Service enjoined by authority. The most suspicious circumstance, however, affecting this class of her Majesty's subjects, was the disposition manifested by many to correspond with the exiles at Louvain, which could at this time be regarded as little less than a seminary of sedition and treasonable practices, against the Queen's crown and person. Several were detected in transmitting money to the priests there, and in distributing writings and books against their country, the Queen, and her government in Church and State. Accounts of these discoveries, and of the proceedings of the Commissioners in general, were daily transmitted to the Secretary ; he was about this time, also, much importuned to hasten the appointment of a new Northern Metropolitan, the see of York being then vacant ; and the Queen, willing to encourage to the utmost the study of Divinity in the Universities, as an antidote to the dangerous attempts and increase of the Papists, caused a letter to be addressed to Sir William, as Chancellor of Cambridge,† authorizing him to give assurance to the Heads of Colleges,

\* See Soames's History of the Reformation, under Henry VIII. vol. i. 399, note 9.

† Strype has brought both these occurrences together, (1568) and been so far the occasion of leading us into an error, that we lost the opportunity of noticing the *latter* event under the proper year. It seems from some papers published by Mr. Ellis in the 2d series of his Collection of Letters, to have decidedly belonged to the year 1560, the *second* year of the Queen's reign.—See vol. ii. Letters clvii. clviii.—We have to lament that this valuable publication did not come into our

Masters and Students there, of her great care of their interests, and of her intention to prefer none in the Church but such as should be well recommended to her, by the Bishops or the Universities, through proper testimonials; which good purposes and designs on the part of her Majesty, the Chancellor, in his communications with the University, promised in every way to further and improve, as occasion might serve. This encouragement given to the Universities, was of the more importance, at the time, to counteract the proceedings of the great men and courtiers, who were by no means circumspect in the disposal of the preferments vested in their hands, bestowing them generally only upon their needy dependants, without due regard either to their learning or personal deserts, whereby the study of Theology, for want of proper encouragement, had been neglected, and much more attention paid to Law and Physic. The Vice-Chancellor (Dr. Perne's) letter, addressed, "*Ornatissimo viro magistro Gulielmo Cecyllo, reginae majestati prudentissim. Secretario, et academiæ Cantabrigiensi cancellario dignissimo;*" to be seen in the Appendix to the first vol. of Strype's Annals, No. xxxviii., is admirably calculated to shew the high sense entertained by the Heads and others, of the University, of the beneficial effects of her Majesty's care and condescension, as well as the great esteem in which the Chancellor was constantly held by that learned body; he being, in the following passage of Dr. Perne's letter, associated by name, as it were, with her Majesty, in the singular benefit conferred on the University: "*Id enim summo reginæ TUOQUE beneficio jam accedit Academiæ, quod nunquam antea sperare aut expectare quisquam potuit:*"—a high compliment, considering his situation, and that he was in fact contributing, in what he did, to obviate the pernicious effects of the more careless and inconsiderate conduct of the great and powerful amongst the Nobility, and other followers of the Court. Of his singular merit indeed, in this way, the Vice-Chancellor's letter is a further proof in the following passage: "*Majorem enim spem in tuo patricinio, quam unquam in ullius positam et collocatum habemus.*"

In the course of this year the Queen appears to have had a very dangerous illness, and to have suffered much both in body and mind; which latter circumstance is easily to be collected from a remarkable prayer, composed for her, says

hands, before we had ourselves taken copies of the letters that passed between the Grey family and Lord Burghley, in the years 1563, &c. and that we had not the opportunity of referring, in its proper place, to the interesting accounts of the death of the Lady Catherine Grey.—Vol. ii. 288.



Strype,\* by Sir John Mason,† a learned man, treasurer of her household, in which the following passage seems clearly to express, what we have before observed, and cannot but imply a certain knowledge of her Majesty's perturbations; "Thou hast now of late, O Lord, for her admonition and correction, stricken thy said servant, with dangerous sickness and bodily infirmity, even to the very point of death; and hast withal abashed her soul with divers troubles and terrors of mind." This prayer was followed by a thanksgiving on her recovery, which appears visibly to have undergone the correction of Sir William Cecil. From what has been advanced on other occasions by the advocates of Mary, we might expect to have her Majesty's mental sufferings imputed to a remorse of conscience, for her harsh conduct to the Royal Captive; but if they had any thing to do with this unhappy emergency, we should ourselves rather impute them to a very distressing sense and feeling, of the hard necessity to which she was driven of acting so harshly against a captive Queen, especially in support of persons little less than rebels in her eyes.‡ The ease of Mary, Queen of Scots, we are persuaded, was at this period entirely a political ease, and if Elizabeth appeared to deal hardly with her, it was rather because she knew not what else to do with her,§ than from any private or womanish pique; in fact, *to get rid of her*, as a hated rival, she had scarcely any thing more to do, than to deliver her up at once to Murray, and her other *enraged* subjects of that party, including the Clergy. We fully believe that Elizabeth chiefly sought a *pretence* to detain her, to baffle the Hamiltons and French party, and under a hope of being able to persuade her,|| to let things continue in Scotland as nominally under the government of her son, but with a Protestant Regency, dependent in a great measure, if not exclusively, on England.

While these things were in agitation, it is not much to be wondered, that Elizabeth should be looked to, as a general refuge from the storms that were now

\* Annals, vol. i. part ii. 267.

† This could not be, as Sir John died in 1566. See before.

‡ Murray was in all instances particularly careful to express his *unwillingness* to accuse or to expose Mary, if it could possibly be avoided. "For we remember," says he in his protestation at Westminster, November 26, 1568, "what person she is whom this matter chiefly touches, the mother of the King our Sovereign, and to whom, in particular, the most part of us are bound for benefits received at her hands."—*Goodall*, ii. Appendix, No. lxxiv.

§ See Life of Elizabeth, i. 305, 6, &c.

|| In order to "avoid the great extremities whereunto her cause might bring her." See the Queen's letter to Sir Francis Knollys, 22d December, 1568. Haynes, 497.

beginning to threaten Protestantism, in the other parts of Europe. It is much to her credit, and much to the credit of this country, that the persecuted in all parts, turned to England for succour and support. The Protestant Princes of Germany, no less than the afflicted Hugonots of France, sought this protection very particularly; at the period of which we are treating, the Queen, through the Prince Palatine of the Rhine, was earnestly solicited to enter into a defensive league with the Protestant confederacy of that country, for defence of the cause of the Christian religion, against the Pope and his party. She was also as strongly urged to give aid to the oppressed subjects of the King of Spain in the Low Countries, and to the French Protestants, cruelly threatened by Charles IX. under the influence of the Guises. The Low-Country affairs were at this time indeed in a deplorable state; Philip II. having delegated his authority to one of the most tyrannical representatives he could well have selected, the Duc d'Alva; who was nominated by him to supersede the Duchess of Parma in the course of this year. [See *Camden*, 120.] D'Alva began with appointing what he chose to call a *Council of Tumults*, intended to take cognizance of every offence, which should appear to have been committed against Philip or the strict letter of his edicts. The persecuted Flemings, with no small reason, denominated this severe tribunal the *Council of Blood*, and indeed it turned out to be so; for though the Prince of Orange was wise enough to withdraw in time to his governments, where he turned Protestant, the Counts of Egmont and Horn, still trusting to the sincerity of Philip's promises, remained with the Court, where they were soon seized upon, committed to custody, and on the arrival of the new Governor, speedily executed, the Prince of Orange's estates being at the same time confiscated. The French Ambassador witnessed the execution of Count Egmont, and wrote to his Court, that "he had just seen that head struck off, whose valour had twice made France to tremble;" alluding to the battles of St. Quintin and Gravelines. The death of this celebrated man was the signal for the total revolt of the Netherlanders, who never laid aside their arms till they had entirely shaken off the detestable Spanish yoke.

Many of the persecuted foreigners, in this wretched state of affairs, came over to England, and were kindly received, being allowed to settle, and peaceably pursue their several callings, in the towns and cities of Norwich, Colchester, Sandwich, Canterbury, Maidstone, Southampton, London, Southwark, and elsewhere; with considerable benefit indeed to the nation, through the introduction of various manufactures.—*Camden*, 119. The Pope issued a Bull

in resentment of the countenance thus given to the distressed Protestants, which was nobly answered by Jewel; the burthen of his argument being contained in these few words, "Is it become a heinous thing to shew mercy?" In such a general resort of persecuted foreigners, it is not to be wondered, that amongst many good, some of a different character obtruded themselves, particularly of the sect of Anabaptists; against these, Grindal, Bishop of London, exerted himself much, endeavouring all he could, by means of the Secretary, to get them sent back, and discharged the realm. As far, however, as protection could, with any safety, be extended to foreign Protestants, Bishop Grindal was earnest to do it, and to the great praise of the Secretary, he appears to have been in all instances, the promoter of such measures at Court, and the person to whom all references upon the subject, were specially directed; he saw plainly, however, into the projects that were on foot, for the extirpation of Protestantism, through the joint agency of the Kings of France and Spain; who, though pretending to be jealous of each other, were evidently confederating for this express purpose; however desirous, therefore, of maintaining peace at home, he judged it quite necessary to advise the Queen, to let the King of France know that she was still interested for the preservation of the Hugonots, and could not, for her own sake, connive at their ruin; but the perplexed state of the Scotch affairs prevented more vigorous measures, and in the meanwhile, a "dissembled peace," as Camden rightly enough calls it, was concluded by the French, accompanied with an insidious offer of the hand of the Duc d'Anjou as a husband for Elizabeth, by the Queen Mother, he being then only a youth of seventeen. This for a time put some stop to hostile proceedings on the part of England, though the people at large were uneasy under the outrages committed by the Spaniards upon our merchants in different parts, and importunate for a war. The Queen indeed sent some aid to the French Hugonots in money and artillery, and disappointed the Duc d'Alva of a supply of money, by an extraordinary interception of the property of some Genoese merchants, consigned to the Low Countries, but which had nearly fallen into the hands of French pirates; to avoid which, the ships which were conveying it, happening to seek refuge in the English ports, the money was taken possession of by the crown, as belonging to the merchants of Genoa, and security given for it as a loan; it being privately known, that had it been permitted to find its way to the Netherlands, it would have been seized upon by the Duc d'Alva, to help him carry on the war, and further



oppress Philip's Flemish subjects. The Spanish Minister earnestly remonstrated against this seizure, and the Duc d'Alva, in retaliation, not only caused the goods of the English merchants in the Low Countries to be confiscated, but seized their persons and cast them into prison. England had been already insulted in the person of her Minister at Madrid; and her West Indian fleet under Hawkins shamefully assaulted in the Bay of Mexico, which was sufficient to make the English Council wary, and rouse the high spirit of Elizabeth, who, in resentment of Alva's proceedings, took the same course against the Flemish merchants and their ships in her ports, to the great discomfiture of the latter; for being more numerous than the English on the other side, it gave a balance in favour of Elizabeth. There is a paper in Haynes, admirably calculated to shew the high spirit with which such affronts were at this period resented on the part of England; it is copied from a minute of Secretary Cecil, the four following Latin clauses express a great deal, though the English is rather stronger, it was presented to the Spanish Ambassador.—  
“I. Res est magni momenti subditorum et mercatorum omnium detentio per armatos homines, et id more bellico; bona, merces, libri. Quæritur an hujusmodi universalis invasio fuerit expresso mandato Regis. II. Regina jam cogitur commemorare multa præterita, quæ nisi hoc modo provocata nunquam voluerit comminisci. III. Injuriae aut saltem ingrata officia sibi et suis præstita. IV. Legati sui contra jus gentium, violatio; rejectus, non auditus; calumniatus et accusatus, sed non auditus.” The Ambassador was put under restraint, and in his anger published a book against the Queen, entitled “*Amadis Oriana*.”  
—See *Camden*.

It may appear scarcely necessary to advert, in this place, to an act of Government, in which the Secretary is supposed to have taken so prominent a part, as to incur the ridicule of his enemies, and not entirely to have escaped the censure of his friends; but as his name is notoriously implicated, we shall just notice it. We allude to what Sanders, in his book *De Schismate Anglicano*, calls *Cecil's Fast*; the effect of an order, by royal proclamation, not only to continue such Romish Fasts, as conduced to the usual consumption of *fish*, but even to add to these a Wednesday's fast, or rather, to make that day also a *fish-day*. There can be little doubt but that the Romish Church system of humiliation and mortification had been perverted to superstitious purposes, and subjected too much to the power of the priesthood, in the granting dispensations, or exacting penalties for any transgressions. To continue them, therefore, exactly on the

old footing of religious discipline might seem to savour too much of a leaning towards the abrogated forms of religion; and yet, in the then imperfect state of political economy, it is not much to be wondered that an alarm should be raised, as to *marine interests*,—the want of due encouragement, for instance, of a hardy race of seamen, and adequate support of the navy. It was judged expedient, therefore, to keep up the Ember-weeks and *Fish* days, according to the old forms, but not exactly with the same designs. To obviate all suspicions of which, the proclamations issued on the occasion, as well to enforce the observation of the Wednesday fast as the others, were made to contain the following clause, that “the same was not required from any liking of Popish ceremonies heretofore used (which utterly are detested), but only to maintain the mariners and the navy of this land, by setting men a-fishing.” The objects being thus openly avowed, ought perhaps to have satisfied one party at the least; but if the Papists were offended at the slur cast upon their forms and customs, others seem to have been no less offended at the careless manner in which all regard to the restraining of appetite, upon spiritual motives, seemed to be set aside.\* This, however, appears to be too harsh a construction to put upon it; fasting and mortification in general, were no subjects of these proclamations; they seem to have been intended as no more than a civil injunction, to uphold the fisheries, and through them the navy. It was imprudent, perhaps, to continue by name the precise fasts of the Romish Church, “Embering and Fish-Days,” for the mere encouragement of the navy, and a bad time certainly for adding to them, but the purpose was avowed, and should not therefore have been misrepresented. We must however observe, in reference to this rather singular transaction, that the appointment of the Wednesday fast, if it be right to call it so, took place about the year 1564, but was by no means well received, so that many dispensations were solicited, and even with the concurrence of the *Secretary* obtained; and indeed by this time it had become so neglected, as to require a fresh proclamation to enforce its observance. That others were attentive to the subject, as a national concern, may be judged from a memorial or discourse, to be seen among the Lansdown MSS., by one Edward Jenyns, addressed to Lord Burghley, and purporting to be on the utility to the realm of observing days for eating fish only. Lord Burghley, or whoever else was concerned in the measure,

\* In the propositions of the celebrated Puritan, Cartwright, in 1570, the twenty-second runs thus: “*Quadragesimatis jejunii observatio, una cum diei Veneris et Sabbati, tum propter superstitionem, tum aliis de causis, est illicita; quamvis illud politico nomine conentur stabilire.*”

should have been better instructed ; even the banter of Erasmus, in his celebrated Colloquy entitled *Ιχθυοφαγία*, might have taught him that the best mode to increase the consumption of fish, would have been rather to abolish the Ember-weeks and Fish-days, than continue them, according to the fishmongers' humorous argument, who looked to a greater gain from a *prohibition* to eat fish, than from the accustomed use of it on particular days :—" Quoniam eo video recidissemores hominum, ut quod vetitum sit, impotentius appetant :"—as *Collier*, however, vol. ii. 558, has chosen to be very severe upon the form of the order, as putting a *religious duty* upon the footing of a mere *civil* regulation, and that by *secular men*, as he calls them ; and as the Papists called it in contempt, as we have observed, *Cecil's Fast*, we are happy in being able to refer to a letter by the Secretary himself to the University of Cambridge, in which his notions of the duty of fasting, as a religious exercise, are admirably set forth, equally free from the superstition of the Papist, and the fanaticism of other orders of Christians. See under the year 1580, *Strype's Annals*, vol. ii. part ii. 287, &c.

At the very close of this year, December 30, 1568, died the celebrated Roger Ascham, an early acquaintance of the Secretary, and a member of his favourite college and university, St. John's, Cambridge.\* He was certainly a very eminent scholar, though he never rose so high in the world as many of his contemporaries and fellow-students. We have spoken of him already, in our first volume, as tutor to the Princess Elizabeth in the time of Edward VI., secretary to Sir Richard Morysine, Edward's ambassador to the Emperor Charles V., and Latin secretary to Edward and Queen Mary ;† a post he also filled under Elizabeth. That he never rose higher may perhaps be attributed (from the accounts extant of him), to a want of prudence, if not of decorum, in the conduct of his life. He appears to have been fond of amusements, which probably threw him occasionally into low company, and rendered him negligent of those manners and accomplishments which might have kept him always in the higher circles, more to his advantage ; for, as an excellent judge has ob-

\* That singular writer, Lloyd, gives him the credit of having preserved the Universities from such robberies as had been committed on the Church ; or, to use his own words, for " hindering those sacrilegious persons who had *dined* upon the *Church* from *supping* on the *Universities*."

† Of his quickness in writing Latin, as well as of his diligence, a remarkable proof is recorded, in the fact of his having written, at the beginning of the reign of Philip and Mary, seven-and-forty letters in three days, to persons of such high rank, that the lowest in dignity was a Cardinal.



served, his State of Germany alone, written while he was abroad with Morysine, and from which we have introduced copious extracts in our first volume, shews its author to have been a man as capable of shining in the cabinet as in the closet. He was about five years older than the Secretary, being born in 1515, and always well known to the same early academical associates, as Sir John Cheke, Sir Thomas Smith, &c. &c.: he was also much beholden, at the beginning of his University studies, to the very same man, Dr. Medcalf, then head of his college, who befriended Sir William Cecil at the outset of his career in life. Sir William seems often to have assisted Ascham;\* and when, upon his death, his widow sought to procure some help at Court, being left in worse circumstances than she had any reason to expect, as a person of good family and good fortune, she caused the manuscript of the *Schoolmaster* to be printed and dedicated to Sir William, as the friend and patron of her husband; a compliment, indeed, to which he was the more entitled, from the work having originated in a learned conversation at which the author had been present, at the Secretary's house and table, in the year 1563, when the great plague was in London, and the Court at Windsor. Ascham's own account of the occurrence is too curious to be omitted. "On the 10th of December," says he, "it fortune'd that in Sir William Cicell's chamber, her Highness' principal Secretary, there dined together these personages; Mr. Secretary himself, Sir William Petre, Sir John Mason, Dr. Wotton, Sir Richard Sackville, Sir Walter Mildmay, Mr. Haddon, Mr. John Astely, Mr. Bernard Hampden, M. Nicasius, and I. I was glad then, and do rejoice yet to remember, that my chance was so happy to be there that day, in the company of so many good and wise men together, as hardly then could have been picked out again out of all England besides. Mr. Secretary hath this accustomed manner, though his head be never so full of most weighty affairs of the realm, yet at dinner time he doth seem to lay them all aside, and findeth ever fit occasion to talk pleasantly of other matters, but most gladly of some matter of learning, wherein he will courteously hear the mind of the meanest at his table. Not long after our sitting down, 'I have strange news brought me,' saith Mr. Secretary, 'this morning, that divers

\* In testimony of his gratitude, he sent Sir William, in 1553, two curious medals, still preserved probably in Burghley House: one of Augustus, a *god* in *brass*, and Nero, a *devil* in *gold*, as the donor himself called them, in a Latin letter written to Sir William, from Brussels, July 7, 1553, to be seen in Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*, vol. i. lib. vi. Mendoza, the Spanish minister, told Ascham, the brass one alone was a present fit for an Emperor.

scholars of Eton be run away from the school for fear of beating.' Whereupon Mr. Secretary took occasion to wish that some more discretion were in many schoolmasters in using correction, than commonly there is, who many times punish rather the weakness of nature than the fault of the scholar; whereby many scholars that might else prove well, be driven to hate learning before they know what learning meaneth; and so are made willing to forsake their book, and be glad to be put to any other kind of living." Ascham proceeds to give an account of the opinions of the several other eminent persons present. Sir William Petre was for the rod; Wotton, being of a mild nature, agreed with the Secretary; Mason blamed (pleasantly) both boys and schoolmasters; Haddon joined Petre; Ascham himself supported Cecil; Sir Walter Mildmay and Mr. Astely said little, and Sir Richard Sackville nothing at all. He then goes on to say, "After dinner, I went up to read with the Queen's Majesty; we read then together in the Greek tongue, as I well remember, that noble oration of Demosthenes against Æschines, for his false dealing in his ambassage to King Philip of Macedon. Sir Richard Sackville came up soon after, and finding me in her Majesties privy-chamber, he took me by the hand, and carrying me to a window, said, 'Mr. Ascham, I would not for a good deal of money have been this day absent from dinner, where, though I said nothing, I gave as good ear, and do consider as well the talk that passed, as any one did there: Mr. Secretary said very wisely, and most truly, that many young wits be driven to hate learning before they know what learning is. I can be good witness to this myself: for a fond schoolmaster, before I was fully fourteen years old, drave me so, with fear of beating, from all love of learning, as now, when I know what difference it is to have learning, and to have little or none at all, I feel it my greatest grief, and find it my greatest hurt that ever came to me, that it was my so ill chance to light upon so harsh a schoolmaster. But seeing it is but in vain to lament things past, and also wisdom to look to things to come, surely, God willing, if God lend me life, I will make this my mishap some occasion of good hap to little Robert Sackville, my son's son, for whose bringing up I would gladly, if it so please you, use specially your good advice. I hear say you have a son much of his age; we will deal thus together: point you out a schoolmaster, who by your order shall teach my son and yours, and for all the rest I will provide, yea though they three do cost me 200 pounds by the year; and besides you shall find me as fast a friend to you and yours as perchance any you have.'" Which promise, says Ascham, the worthy gentleman surely kept with me until his dying day.

Upon Sir Richard's further discourse on the subject, Ascham undertook to write upon the subject, and prepared his curious Treatise of the Schoolmaster : but Sir Richard died before it was finished, and the work would have been lost but for the care of Sir *William Cecil*, of whom Ascham thus speaks : " God, the mover of goodness, prosper always him and his, as he hath many times comforted me and mine ; and I trust to God shall comfort more and more, of whom most justly I may say, and very oft and always gladly I am wont to say, that sweet verse of *Sophocles*, spoken by *Oedipus* to worthy *Theseus*, Εχω γαρ α'χω δια σε κ' ουκ αλλον Βροτων : " and indeed Sir William befriended his family, as well as himself, putting his eldest son to St. John's College, and procuring for him a fellowship there.

The Queen's Progresses, 1568, collected from Lord Burghley's Diary are as follow :

" July 4. The Queen's Majesty at Greenwich.

" July 6. At Howard Place in London. [The Charter House, residence of the Duke of Norfolk.]

" — 14, 15. At Havering.

" — 19. At Copt Hall." [The seat of Sir Thomas Heneage.]

In this Progress the Queen also visited Giddy Hall, the seat of Sir Anthony Cook, father of Lady Cecil.

" July 25. At Enfield. [Belonging to the Queen. See a long account of it in Nichols, vol. i. 101.]

" — 30. At Hatfield. [Where the Queen formerly resided.]

" August — At St. Albans.

" At Whaddon. [The seat of Lord Grey de Wilton.]

" At Eston. [The seat of the Earl of Pomfret.]

" The Queen's Majesty was at Grafton in Progress.

" At Bycester.

" At Rycot. [The seat of Mr. Norrice, (qy. Norreys?) commonly called ' Master Norrice.' See Nichols, i. 250.]

" At Newbury.

" At Reading."



## CHAP. X.

1569.

Eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, commenced November 17, 1568.

*Extract from Lord Burghley's Life, by a Domestic, containing the account of a Conspiracy against him, when Master of the Wards—Rapiu's account of the same Conspiracy—Camden—Of the Queen's conduct in it—Extract from Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, relating to Cecil—Names of persons concerned in the Conspiracy—Of Lord Pembroke—Letters from the Earl of Sussex to Cecil—Of Leicester—Prayer in favour of the Queen's Marriage with the Archduke, attributed to Cecil—Of Cecil's Views with regard to the Succession—Extract from Hallam, on the Conspiracy—Passage from Lord Burghley's Life, by a Domestic, with the account of a Papist's attempt to Assassinate him—Rebellion in the North—Outrages on the Churches, &c.—The Priest Morton—Sir Thomas Smith's Pamphlet—Book attributed to Cecil by Strype—Illness of Cecil; his Letters to Sir R. Sadler—Young Earl of Rutland—Duke of Norfolk—Memorial by Cecil, under the title of Perils and Remedies—Knox's Letter to Wood—Passage from Rapin concerning Mary—Memorable Speech of Elizabeth, reported by Bishop Jewel—Montanns' History of the Spanish Inquisition published—Rodolphus Cavallerius—Theodore Wierus' Letter to Cecil—Cecil's Letter to Signor Bertano—Killegrew's Letters to Cecil—Elizabeth excommunicated—Duke of Alva—Mary's Charges against Elizabeth and Cecil—Extract from Strype concerning Mary—Her Letter to Elizabeth from Tutbury Castle—Sir Walter Mildmay's Opinion, in Burnet—Mr. White's Account of Mary at Bolton—Lord Hunsdon's Letter—Lord Shrewsbury's Account of Mary's expenses—Letter from Cecil to Lord Shrewsbury—Letter from Lord Leicester to the Earl of Sussex—Sir N. Throckmorton's Conversation with the Earl of Leunox—Henry Carey sent to the Regent of Scotland with Inquiries—Letter from Lords Huntingdon and Hereford to Cecil—Bishop of Ross—Admiral Coligni—Puritans—Christopher Foster's Letter—Dr. Whitgift—Disturbances at Cambridge—Cecil appealed to in all cases—Death of Bishop Boner—Dr. Story—Douay College founded—Colleges at Rome—Persons—First Public Lottery.*

THE Ninth Chapter of Lord Burghley's Life, by a Domestic, relates so entirely, with the exception of one section only, to the transactions of *this* year, that we might reasonably transcribe it at length; if so succinct an account of the most

important affairs could answer all our purposes. It begins with the appointment of the Secretary to be Master of the Wards in the room of Sir Thomas Parry, which took place in the month of January, 1561, and of which we have already spoken under that year. It next proceeds to notice the Rebellion in the North, of which more will be to be said hereafter ; but as the writer of the Life takes occasion to make this rebellion an introduction to a catastrophe, which befel Sir William early in the year we are entering upon, we shall copy his words, following Mr. Peck's edition of the work :—

“ At the time of which accident (himself being Secretary alone, and thereby all dispatches passing his hands) he tooke so intolerable paines and care, and gave so provident counsell, as matters weare so quickly expedited, and politequely carried, that the rebells weare soon suppressed, without bataile, blood, or danger ; to the honor of the Quene and weale of the realm.

“ Thus happiely beginning, he constantlie contynued his course, as hath been seen, to the good of Prince, People, and Contrie ; and to his own immortal praise and worthy reputation, with such wisdom and moderation as was worthy a man of his placc, all the time of his service, as Secretarie, carrieing himself so strangeli tempered, almost above the nature of a man, as he was never seen to be angrie ; but on the contrary, most patient in hearing, and ready in dispatching ; still continuynge constant in his business, and withall, so courteous and affable, as no man went from him discontented or discouraged ; which made him loved, feared, and honored !

“ In the time of which [his last] fortunate risinge,\* you must indeed imagine that the harts of many did also rise against his fortune ; who weare more hot in envieing him, than able to follow him : detracting his praises, disgracing his services, and plotting his danger.

“ As particularly on a time I heard him tell, that a book, pestilentlie and passionately penned, against the nobility, came to his hands, and was seen on his table, by a great nobleman, a counsellor, which book he had read with great dislike, noting many notable lies and faults of the writer.

“ Yet there was a formall tale told to the Lords of the Counsell, (who then weare most of them great noblemen) and to divers others of the nobilitie, inferring and inforcing it to be done, or procured by himself, to disgrace the nobilitie.

\* Viz.—his promotion to be Master of the Wards.

“Whereupon such a fire was kindled against him, in the parts of all the lordes, as a plot was laid to cut him off.

“He was thereupon called before the Counsell, without the Quene’s knowledge, and charged with it.

“Which though he sufficiently answered, yet it was resolved [before that] what answer so ever he made he should be sent to the Tower ; and then they would find matter enough against him.

“Whereof having advertisement, he wrote to the Quene of their purpose, who commanded, that nothing should be done against him, without her privitie, or els he had byn sent to the Toure without her knowledge.

“So the fire was covered, but not quenched ; for not long after, a villain was hired to kill him, and set at a stairs foot to dispatch him, as he came from the Quene, but, being warned of it, he went down another way, and so escaped death.

“Here maie be noted how great mischiefs may rise upon small causes ! for all this was only for havinge the booke, which he detested and condemned as much as they ; and sought to have the writer apprehended ; as belonged to his place. Yet his jealous enemies would have turned his honest meaninge to a horrible mischiefe.”

Of this conspiracy against the Secretary, the particulars of which, in many instances, are similar to the case of his friend Cranmer, in the reign of Henry VIII., various accounts are to be met with in different authors. Rapin’s statement of matters is perhaps as full and as circumstantial as any, though it may be doubted whether he is quite right in the motives he assigns, for the resentment shewn—we mean with respect to Cecil’s preference of the House of Suffolk, as the presumptive heirs to the throne, in disparagement of the Scottish claims. This does not seem quite clear : in all other respects his history of the transaction may deserve to be transcribed ; it is as follows :

“Among all Elizabeth’s ministers and counsellors, there was not one so heartily attached to his Mistress’s interest as CECIL, who was Secretary of State ; all the rest had their private views, to which they strove to adapt the Queen’s, and the nation’s interest ; but Cecil minded only the Queen’s, and was in great favour with her. Therefore to him chiefly she imparted her most secret thoughts with respect to the government of the State. Several Privy Counsellors were engaged in the Queen of Scots’ party ; that is, they wished the crown of England were secured to her, in case Elizabeth died without issue. They were of opinion it



was a thing agreeable to equity, justice, and the laws of the land ; and pretended it was the only way to prevent the troubles which might happen after the Queen's decease ; but Elizabeth thought that when they considered the public advantages, they did not sufficiently attend to her safety. Mary did not pretend only to be Elizabeth's presumptive heir : it was well known her pretensions reached much further, and that many were persuaded her title was preferable to the Queen's. If, therefore, she was appointed Elizabeth's successor, it could be only in virtue of her birthright, and not in consequence of Henry's will, in which she was not so much as named, whereas many thought Elizabeth derived her title solely from thence. So, in taking this course, the titles of the two Queens would have been put in opposition, very much to Elizabeth's disadvantage ; consequently, her fear was, this nomination would increase the number of Mary's friends, and in the end endeavours would be used to set her on the throne before the time appointed. All who were displeased with the Government, thought the nation would get by the change. The Catholics heartily wished it, and amongst the Protestants themselves there were many to whom it was indifferent which Queen was on the throne, because they made no great conscience of conforming to all the changes which might be made in religion, as was the case more than once. It was therefore of great moment to hinder Mary from being nominated to succeed her. So, she could not but have equal regard for those, whom she saw sincerely attached to her private interests. Among these, *Cecil* was the chief, and it was he, also, whom Mary's friends considered as her most dangerous enemy, and the rather as he had frequently shewn his inclination to the house of Suffolk, before the death of the Duchess of that name. This was the real motive of a plot laid in the beginning of the year 1569, to ruin that Minister. The Duke of Norfolk, the Marquis of Winchester, the Earls of Pembroke, Northumberland, Westmoreland, Arundel, Leicester, and others, entered into this sort of conspiracy. They accused *Cecil* of being the cause of the Queen's detaining the Spanish money, and by that, of running a manifest risk of a war with Spain, which could not but be very prejudicial to trade. They flattered themselves that upon this charge the Queen would send the Secretary to prison, and then they made no question they should find ways enough to effect his ruin. But the Queen being too quick-sighted not to see their aim, and the motive of their plot, commanded them silence in such a manner, as destroyed all their hopes of success, either then or for the future."

Camden's account is much the same ; only he attributes to Throckmorton,

(Cecil's "Emulator," as he calls him), the suggestion of sending him to the Tower, for if he were but once imprisoned, means to "undo him," it was observed, "would not be far to seek." "But the Queen (by whose discovery, I know not), came to the knowledge hereof in good time, and Cecil, through the magnanimous fortitude of his Princess (who coming upon them in the very instant of time, restrained them by her beck), and easily defeated the plot that was raised against him.\* And withall she broke the neck of another more secret design of theirs, openly to proclaim the Queen of Scots undoubted heir of England, if every thing should fall out other than well to Queen Elizabeth, and this in opposition to a book sent abroad in favour of the title of Suffolk." In which passage Camden appears ignorant of the means by which the Queen came to the knowledge of the plot, but if the author of the *Life by a Domestic* be right, *Cecil* himself wrote to acquaint her with it. The prompt and decisive step she took to save her faithful servant on this occasion from disgrace, and perhaps destruction, exceedingly resembles, as we have before hinted, the mode by which her father opportunely interposed to save Cranmer, from a conspiracy of a like nature, his enemies having exactly in the same manner, calculated upon sending him first to prison, and then bringing forward their accusations, against a disgraced and helpless rival. We have, in Strype's *Life of Archbishop Parker*, the winding up, as it were, of this unsuccessful endeavour to destroy the credit of this great Minister. "I end this year," (1569) says he, "with the emergence of an excellent man, Secretary *Cecil*, out of a very great danger of disgrace, if not of death; most of the great men about the Queen combining to bring her into displeasure with him. He was the Archbishop's chief and fast friend, and to whom he constantly made his applications on all occasions, and so did all the rest of the good Bishops in their affairs and necessities, so that on his safety

\* In the *Memoirs of the Life and Administration of William Cecil, Baron Burleigh, 1738*, it is said of him, "That such was his loyalty, that it would bear no aspersions; for his regard for the royal family was so well known and attested, that though he was accused to all the Princes under whom he lived, they not only discredited his enemies, but refused to hear them;" p. 19, 20.—The same writer enters rather largely into the nature of this conspiracy, and takes the opportunity of giving a short account of the several Lords of the Council concerned in it, distinguishing between the *workers* of it, and those who were *wrought upon* to join in it. Leicester being generally allowed to be at the head of the former, among the most respectable of his dupes, he justly ranks the Duke of Norfolk; pp. 43—47.

and credit with the Queen, the Church's welfare in great measure depended. In what strength and security this great patron and friend of the Archbishop and hierarchy now again stood, after a desperate shock, I had rather express in his own words than mine, writing thus to a friend of his: "I am in quietness of mind, as feeling the nearness and readiness of God's favour to assist me with his grace, to have a disposition to serve him, before the world, and therein have I lately proved his mere goodness to preserve me from some clouds or mists; in the midst whereof I trust mine honest actions are proved to have been lightsome and clear. And to make this rule more proper and special to be applied, I find the Queen's Majesty, my gracious good lady, without change of any part of her old good meaning towards me, and so I trust only by God's goodness to observe the continuance. I am also presently moved to believe, that all my Lords, from the greatest to the meanest, think my actions honest and painful, and do profess inwardly to bear me as much good-will as ever they did heretofore."\*

Rapin, in the passage above cited, has given so good an account of the reasons, which withheld Elizabeth from declaring Mary to be her heir, that we entirely incline to think, that without being the decided enemy of that unfortunate Princess, *Cecil*, as a truly honest Counsellor, could have given his Sovereign no better advice, and that those who endeavoured at this time to alienate her affections from him, were only seeking, as the same author observes, to further their own private views, regardless of Elizabeth's safety. The names alone of those who are particularly said to have conspired against him on this

\* It is somewhat remarkable, but seems to confirm the Secretary's remark above, that Lord Pembroke, who died this year, made (by a special codicil to his will) Sir William one of his Executors, or Overseers of his Will, with a bequest of 50*l.* in money, plate, or jewels.—See Collins's *Peerage*, ii. 18. It is also singular that in this appointment Sir William should have been associated with others of the confederates against him, as the Earl of Leicester and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton. The variance between the Duke of Norfolk and the Secretary seems also to have been soon settled, as appears by two letters from the Earl of Sussex to the latter, printed by Lodge; in the first of which, dated May 15, 1569, his Lordship sorely laments the breach between two persons he so highly esteemed, recommends a speedy reconciliation, offering himself as a mediator, if a third person should be wanting. In the second letter, dated early in June, the Earl congratulates Sir William on a reconciliation having taken place, between two persons, "whom," he says, "the world hath always judged to be void of private motives, and to respect only the Queen and her realm in all their actions."—He attributes all that had passed to the officiousness and misrepresentations of false friends.



occasion, are sufficient to prove this. The Duke of Norfolk had been cajoled by the Regent of Scotland, Maitland, and others (particular Leicester), into a prospect of espousing the unhappy Queen of Scots; the Marquis of Winchester, was by his own account a mere "bending willow," ready for any new impulse that might arise, and decidedly one of those so well described by Rapin, who would make "no great conscience of conforming to all the changes which might be made in religion." The Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland were soon after in open rebellion, and, as well as Arundel and Pembroke, were Catholics; and of Leicester, little more need be said, than that Cecil was no man to further his purposes, as regarded either of the two Queens; for he had indisputably a view to both, as things might turn out. In 1564, Camden asserts, as we have before shewn, that he was wooing the Queen of Scots "with all the offices he could, labouring to win her favour;" and yet in 1566\* we find him almost an avowed competitor with the Archduke Charles for the hand of Elizabeth, on which occasion, indeed, the honest interposition of *Cecil* might well be expected to excite an irreconcilable resentment, however outward appearances might occasionally be assumed to the contrary; for to him is ascribed, and probably with sufficient truth, the following paper in favour of the Queen's marriage with the Archduke, and against the pretensions of Leicester; it is too curious to be omitted, especially, if, as a learned author well observes, "it was actually laid before the Queen, it shews the plainness and freedom which this great statesman ventured to use towards her:"

*De Matrimonio Reginae Angliæ cum extero Principe, April, 1566.*

*Reasons to move the Queen to accept Charles.*

Besides his person, his birth, his alliance.

I. She shall not diminish the honour of a Prince, to match with a Prince.

II. When she shall receive messages from Kings, her husband shall have of himself by birth a countenance to receive them.

III. Whatsoever he shall bring into the realm, he shall spend here in the realm.

IV. He shall have no regard to any person but to please the Queen.

V. He shall have no opportunity nor occasion to tempt him to seek the Crown after the

*Reasons against the Earl of L.*

I. Nothing is increased by marriage of him either in riches, estimation, or power.

II. It will be thought that the slanderous speeches of the Queen with the Earl have been true.

III. He shall study nothing but to enhance his own particular friends to wealth, to offices, to lands, and to offend others.

Here follow 19 particular names of persons to be so served, which it is unnecessary to repeat.

Queen, because he is a stranger, and hath no friends in the realm to assist him.

VI. By marriage with him the Queen shall have the friendship of K. Philip, which is necessary, considering the likelihood of falling out with France.

VII. No Prince of England ever remained without good amity with the House of Burgundy; and no Prince had ever less alliance than the Queen of England hath; nor any Prince ever had more cause to have friendship and power to assist her estate.

VIII. The French King will keep Calais against his pact.

IX. The Queen of Scots pretendeth title to the crown of England, and so did never foreign Prince since the Conquest.

X. The Pope also and all his parties are watching adversaries to the crown.

IV. He is infamed by the death of his wife.

V. He is far in dett.

VI. He is like to prove unkind or jealous of the Queen's Majesty.

I have inserted the whole of both statements, to shew what Cecil's real views seem to have been with regard to the succession, and which many have regarded as a studiously concealed mystery.

He could not possibly wish, for the good of the nation, to have *Mary* succeed. Not only her own religious principles must have prevented this, but he must have known and felt, that according to the last clause of the foregoing paper, it could only have led to a revival of the influence of "the Pope and all his parties," as it is admirably expressed. If he inclined to the Suffolk line, the cause of Protestantism might be one motive; their title under Henry's will having a parliamentary sanction, another; and a third, perhaps, the affinity which the Grey family in their letters, as I have before noticed, seem constantly to have acknowledged. If, however, he had any inclinations of this description, they seem to have been quite overruled by his desire that the Queen should marry some foreign Prince of high connexions, to increase her alliances, interrupt the competition of dangerous rivals, thwart the views of Leicester, give hope of a regular succession, and maintain her dignity. And this he seems honestly to have laid before her, at the hazard of exactly such jealousies and enmities, as, at the commencement of this year, were excited against him, but which, as it happened, turned out highly to his honour and advantage. Mr. Hallam, in the first volume of his Constitu-

tional History of England, appears to take so just a view of this conspiracy, that I shall conclude my remarks upon it with his able note, p. 138.

“Camden ascribes the powerful coalition formed against him (Cecil), in 1569, wherein Norfolk and Leicester were combined with all the Catholic Peers, to his predilection for the House of Suffolk: but it was more likely to be owing to their knowledge of his integrity and attachment to his Sovereign, which would steadfastly oppose their wicked design of bringing about Norfolk’s marriage with Mary, as well as to their jealousy of his influence. Carte reports, on the authority of the dispatches of Fenelon, the French ambassador, that they intended to bring him to account for breaking off the ancient league with the House of Burgundy, or, in other words, for maintaining the Protestant interest.”

A Papist writer, under the name of Andreas Philopater, gives an account of this confederacy against Cecil at some length. Norfolk and Leicester belonged to it, and the object was to defeat the Suffolk succession, which Cecil and Bacon favoured. Leicester betrayed his associates to the Queen. It had been intended that Norfolk should accuse the two Counsellors before the Lords, “*ea ratione ut è senatu regiâque abreptos ad curiæ januas in crucem agi præciperet, eoque perfecto rectè deinceps ad forum progressus explicaret populo tum hujus facti rationem, tum successionis etiam regnandi legitimam seriem, si quid forte reginæ humanitus acciderit.*”

Having given an account of this singular confederacy, designed to ruin for ever the credit of the Secretary with his Sovereign, I shall return to the narrative of his Domestic, who relates a circumstance still more alarming, which seems to have occurred to him about the same time. I shall still follow Mr. Peck’s edition of the work, discarding the ancient spelling.

“Likewise as he had some foes at home, so he also wanted not enemies abroad; for another time a Popish practiser and traitorous villain was by some seminaries persuaded to kill him; and being with him alone in his chamber, standing behind him, leaning on his chair, had not the power to perform his villany, though when he came in he took his dagger ready in his hand to do it. So here you see, though his wisdom were a worker, yet only God was his upholder, and the steps to honour are much pains and more danger; the highest rising being ever subject to the lowest falling. But in despite of envy, danger, and death, he held on his high way as by a strait line, forgetting and forgiving injuries, truly performing his service to his Prince and his country.

“And though at that time, in the beginning of the alteration of religion, and



settling a new form of government in the state, it may be imagined what wars were threatened and put in execution, what secret plots and practices were set on foot both at home and abroad, what wants were to be supplied, what division was then among the Council, and what doubts among the people, were then on foot; wherein himself being the principal actor, took so painful care, and gave so careful counsel, as with his discreet and politic temperance and providence the government was wrought and brought to so good order and peaceable state, as hath forty years been seen and tasted in England, though seldom found or read of in other nations."

This is certainly an account which history in all respects confirms. The changes in religion and government, the actual and menaced wars, the secret plots and practices at home and abroad, the urgent wants to be supplied to give surety to the kingdom, the divisions in the Council, and fluctuating doubts and discordant sentiments of the populace, were enough to try the patience of any Minister, and greatly embarrass any less prudent, sagacious, and collected Statesman than the illustrious subject of this Memoir, who had constantly in view the preservation of his Sovereign, the independence and glory of England, the firm establishment of the English Protestant Church, without too great a departure from the primitive system of doctrine and discipline, to gratify the wishes, demands, and expectations of other seceders from the Church of Rome;—the Episcopal Hierarchy being a fair and justifiable balance between the discarded Romanists and the too intruding Calvinists of the Geneva school.

The Life by a Domestic distinguishes this year, properly enough, by the rebellion in the North; I shall therefore now proceed to give some account of this threatened revolution.—It happened indeed towards the close of the year, but is of sufficient importance to take the lead of other transactions.—The heads of this rebellion, were the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, two of the Noblemen, who, as has been before shewn, were parties to the confederacy against the Secretary. The avowed object of this insurrection, was in behalf of the *true succession*, that is, in fact, in behalf of the Queen of Scots,\* nor was it dissembled that they wished to have the old religion restored. Their public declarations, as communicated by the Dean of York to Grindal, Bishop of

\* "Whom the world beholdeth to be the principal hidden cause of these troubles." These words appear in the Queen's letters to Lord Shrewsbury at the time; and it was as much Mary's misfortune, as her fault to be so. Where she did not act herself, others would act for her, and not always so much *for her*, as against Elizabeth and the Protestant Church.

London, are to be seen in Strype's Annals, 1569. The Secretary, seems, in those declarations (in which it must be observed, the Duke of Norfolk, and the Earls of Arundel and Pembroke, are associated); to be particularly aimed at, in the denunciation of certain "common enemies of the realm about the Queen's person, by whose sinister and detestable counsel and practice," the lives and liberties of the insurgents and their party, were said to be endangered. This part of their declaration, however, was admirably answered in a pamphlet ascribed to Sir Thomas Smith, and addressed to the rebels.

"Sooth, many disordered and evil-disposed persons about the Queen have marred all; is there a greater disorder than rebellion? Is there any worse disposition than treason? Is there any greater falsehood than thus to deform the Queen's most noble government? Are you so blind as not to see the Queen touched, though to beguile you, her name be spared? Come they whom you call *disordered*, to the Queen uncalled? Are they not of her Council by her wise and good choice? Deal they not in the causes of the realm, to such ends and with such means as her Majesty appointeth? Do they any thing without her authority and good liking, as there is good cause? Make they any laws? Require they any subsidies? Do they the greatest things without the assent of the whole realm? Your own assent by your deputies and burgesses in open Parliament, whereunto her Majesty's assent is had? Or in causes out of Parliament, is aught put in execution without her Highness's will and pleasure? Cease then to be so beguiled." Again, "But what have these disordered, and evil-disposed persons about the Queen done? They have overcome true religion, say your seducers and false teachers.—Is there any alteration of religion received from any other than from the word of God himself? Do they mean you well that take God's word from you? That destroy the Bible? Tear and tread under foot the Scripture of the word of God? Can they wish you to see, that would take away your light? This path is not the way to true religion, but to error; which they would not have you see, that persuade you to blindfold yourselves against the truth of God's Gospel.

"For sound religion receive it, as God has taught it—read his word: and for the delivery and explication of it, it beloveth you, being no better clerks than you are, to credit the whole parliament, the learned clergy of the realm, and those that teach you by the word of God. And learn it in such sort and place as it is to be taught—your Churches as they were reformed: the word of God read in such tongue as you understand. The Sacraments ministered to your comfort in such sort as you might feel the sense of them, and be edified by them.

The good example of your ministers living in holy matrimony with their own wives, and abstaining from yours, and teaching you obedience, justice, and charity ; these be the means to learn truth."

No long deliberation seemed to be necessary to induce the Queen's Council to proclaim the two leading Earls (Northumberland and Westmoreland, both needy and unwise personages, though bearing the high names of Percy and Neville) to be traitors ;\* and the Secretary, as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, apprehending, that many of the young students connected with the northern parts of England, might be misled by false rumours, and depart the University and repair to their friends, took especial care by a letter to the Vice Chancellor, to have all things kept quiet there ; foreseeing probably, a speedy termination to so rash a movement :† and indeed it was soon quelled, though probably designed and fostered by Popish emissaries, immediately connected with Rome,‡ described in a homily, then put forth, as the Pope's "disguised chaplains, creeping in laymen's apparel into men's houses, and as blind guides leading the blind, bringing or driving the Queen's weak subjects into the ditch of horrible rebellion." Great outrages were committed against the Churches, and the Bibles and Prayer-books found therein, which the rebels cut and tore and trampled under their feet ; having for an ensign, or standard, a *plough*, the *five wounds of Christ*, and a *cross*. They were to be assisted by parties from Scotland devoted to Mary, and by the Duke of Alva from Flanders ; and, as Camden relates, they were principally instigated to engage in these treasonable practices,

\* This appears to have taken place about the 26th or 27th of November, from a letter of Sir William's to Sir Ralph Sadler.—*State Papers*, &c. vol. ii. 40.

† Strype is disposed to attribute to the Secretary also a notable book, as he calls it, addressed to the rebels soon after the rebellion was quelled, being a warning against the dangerous practices of the Papists, and especially the partners of the late rebellion. His reason for thinking it to be written by Sir William, is, because, as he says, "he commonly framed occasional discourses upon more eminent occurrences of state, and did as much by his writing as by his counsel." Several strong passages from this work, are to be seen in Strype, and to which we must be content to refer, only observing that some passages so directly relate to great public incidents, falling under the particular notice and observation of Sir William, that it seems quite reasonable to suppose he at least had a hand in it, if he were not altogether the author of it.

‡ See, in proof of this, the Bishop of Ross's confessions in Murdin, under f. 1571, particularly p. 60. These confessions should be carefully looked to for a proper understanding of the Northern Rebellion, its maintainers, and its extent.—In fact, as the Duke of Alva had been treated with to send over a foreign force, the principal object could not be mistaken.



by a Popish Priest, of the name of *Morton*,\* expressly sent by the Bishop of Rome, [see Murdin, p. 60.] to pronounce Queen Elizabeth to be a heretic, and thereby to have incurred a forfeiture of all her dominion and power. Whatever help and support they expected to receive, would appear to have totally failed them; many of the Nobility who were solicited to join them, sent the letters to the Queen; the Duke of Norfolk himself being one of those who did so.† In a very short time, they discovered the error they had committed, and both the Earls, passing the borders, sought refuge in Scotland. The Earl of Westmoreland was so fortunate afterwards, as to find means to get into Flanders, to the preservation of his life, but only to pass his days in comparative poverty and distress, a miserable pensioner of the King of Spain, while the Earl of Northumberland, had the misfortune to be delivered up into the hands of government and finally executed.‡

\* For a further account of Morton, and the part he bore in this and other conspiracies against the Queen, see *Strype's Annals*, ch. xxxvi. under the year 1575, and *Turner's Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. ii. ch. xxvii.

† For a specimen of the letters sent, and of the rebels' protestation, see *Haynes*, 563, 4, 5. These were forwarded to the Court by the Earl of Derby. The Duke of Norfolk's vindication of himself may be found at p. 567; Lord Pembroke's, 568; and Lord Arundell's, 569. There is an admirable state paper upon this rebellion to be seen at p. 555.

‡ At the time of this rebellion the Secretary appears to have laboured under a severe illness, so severe as to confine him to his bed; from which he wrote to Sir Ralph Sadler on the 20th of November, to recommend to his care the young Earl of Rutland, who at the early age of thirteen was allowed by the Queen to join the army against the rebels; rather to give countenance to his tenants, than engage in much service. He was of high blood and not very distantly related to the throne, as Cecil himself informed Sir Francis Walsingham some time afterwards, in the following curious terms. "In expressing his lineage you may boldly affirm him to be akin to the Queen's Majesty, both by King Henry VIII. her father, and also by the Q. Mother, and he is of the blood royal in the same degree that my Lord of Huntingdon is, the difference being only that my Lord of Huntingdon is of a brother of King Edward the IVth, and my Lord of Rutland of the sister of the same King, and indeed thereby he is as near in blood, though further in danger of fortune's wheel, which is busy with carriage of King's crowns to and fro."—*Digges' Compleat Ambassador*, 39. Being a ward of the Court, this young Nobleman received great attentions from Sir William in his capacity of Master of the Wards. Camden says, he became a profound *lawyer* under his care, and accomplished with all polite learning. He died however very early.—On his going into the north, Sir William sent his own son with him, Thomas, afterwards Lord Exeter, to be employed also in the service of her Majesty.—See *Sadler's State Papers*, vol. ii. 34, and 40. and *Strype's Annals*, vol. ii. 36. On the 19th of December following, the Secretary writes to Sir Ralph, "I am not in health nor ease, and I wish myself there where I am sure my mind quieted, would amend

We have seen how much the Duke of Norfolk was implicated in these affairs, though probably with a very imperfect knowledge of the actual designs of the parties with whom he was nominally associated, all of whom, as well in Scotland as England, seemed to make his projected marriage with the Queen of Scots, a handle to accomplish their purposes. It is indeed, it must be confessed, extremely difficult to unravel the mystery of this negotiation, especially as we have the account from the three suspicious contemporary historians, whom it is often hard to reconcile. Rapin has applied his diligence to do this on many occasions, and to him therefore we would refer, not for a solution of the difficulties attending the case, but for an account of its progress. As far as Norfolk himself was concerned, he professed to have had in view no more than to prevent Mary's marrying a foreign Catholic Prince, [see his letter to the Secretary in Haynes, 572.] to promote the union of the two kingdoms, and further the establishment of the Protestant religion in both countries. But with such views as these he could not be much in the confidence of the heads of the rebellion. The Duke, however, seems to have been more upon his guard, as to joining the northern insurgents, having, as we before said, sent their letters to the Court. And it was for this reason, probably, that we find the Secretary addressing to him, at this time, one of his customary memorials, under two titles of *Perils* and *Remedies*, which, as descriptive of the state of the nation, as it appeared to this discerning and indefatigable Statesman, we shall feel it our duty to transcribe.

### *Perils.*

“A conspiracy of the Pope, King Philip, the French King, and sundry Potentates in Italy, to employ all their forces for the subversion of the Professors of the Gospel.

my unquiet body;” (probably at Burghley.) Sir Ralph Sadler being now serving with Lord Sussex, Lieutenant of the North, the Secretary commends him highly, for the good reports he made of Lord Sussex's zeal and judicious conduct, as that Lord, he observes, had “hard constructors of his doings at Court;” meaning probably Leicester and his faction. “My Lord of Sussex' doings, hath been well reported by you, and so I think he hath deserved, otherwise he hath had some lack of allowance here, which will, I trust, amend, and it is a good deed to hold up any nobleman when he meaneth well.” In another place he says of Lord Sussex; “I know none endowed with better parts for a nobleman, and peer of the realm, than he is.” The rivalry between this Lord, and Lord Leicester is pretty generally known; it is to the credit of the Secretary that he was on Lord Sussex's side. “My knowledge of his worthiness,” says he in one of his letters to Sir Ralph, “maketh me affectionated to him, and certainly nothing else.”—He could not have said so much of Lord Leicester.

“The intention of the same formed to be extended against England, immediately after the subduing of the Prince of Condé and his associates.\*

“The Spaniard daily avaunts in the Low Countries within short time to possess this realm without any battle.

“The opinion they have conceived of the weakness of this realm, by reason of the lack of experience of the subjects in feats of war; and secondly, for that the papistical subjects, being fled out of the realm, have made books in manner of registers: accounting, in every shire and great town of the realm, who be assured to the Roman religion; making their estimate of more than the best half of noblemen and gentlemen to be theirs.

“The secret collections of money that are made in the realm by procurators of the Papists.

“The evident knowledge had for a truth, what the judges, the lawyers, both of the common law and the civil, are in this matter.†

“The danger hereof also is the greater, because the wise Papists of England, as well those abroad as those at home, are by former examples taught, if ever the power shall be in their hands, never to suffer any, being contrary to them, to have power: remembering that which is said in the science military, *non licet bis in bello peccare*.

“The discovery of a great number of gentlemen lately in Lancashire, that have, upon persuasion, forborne to come to the church; with opinion shortly to enjoy the use of the Popish religion.

“Lastly, to speak as my entire thoughts be by the examples of the Scripture; the long tranquillity which this realm hath enjoyed, the plentiful teaching of the truth, and the general neglecting thereof, must needs provoke the wrath of God.”

We have given this statement of Perils at length, because we think the truth of it may be well proved from history; and the Secretary as well as his Royal

\* Knox, in a letter to Wood, Secretary to the Regent Murray, dated Feb. 14, 1568, writes, “In my opinion England and Scotland have both no less cause to fear than the faithful in France, for what they suffer in present action is laid up in store, let us be assured, for both countries.”—*McCrie*, Appendix, No. x. In another letter of the same year, Sept. 10, he writes, “Let England take heed, for assuredly their neighbours’ houses are on fire.”

† The lawyers appear to have been a good deal disaffected — some of them being called before the Council, or ecclesiastical Commissioners, alleged, “That they came to the Temple Church upon Sundays and holydays, meaning no more than that they came and walked about the roundal there.”—*Strype*, *Collier*, &c.



Mistress, are continually charged by the advocates of Queen Mary, not only with having exaggerated the threatened dangers, but with having actually pretended dangers for which there was no ground. It is fit, therefore, that those who would do strict justice to the vigilance of the Queen's Ministers, should search the pages of history, and judge for themselves of the actual perils with which Elizabeth and her kingdom were beset; instead of vainly attributing to the former, motives of a merely private nature; the gratification of her own narrow, selfish, and malignant feelings, in the persecution of a helpless woman,\* in refusing to acknowledge her to be her heir. "I care not for myself," said she, on a memorable occasion; "my life is not dear to me—my care is for my people. I pray God, whosoever succeedeth me, be as careful as I am. They which know what cares I bear, would not think I took any great joy in wearing a crown." "These ears," says Bishop Jewel, from whom we have the account, "heard, when her Majesty spake these words."

We now proceed, then, to the Secretary's statement of

#### *Remedies.*

"The principal is, to amend our lives; and to be thankful indeed for the benefit of the Gospel.

"The second resteth in using those means that Almighty God has left to this realm, which consisteth in many parts, viz.

"That the Queen's Majesty unite all her faithful subjects, that profess the Gospel sincerely, both to herself, by giving them comfort and credit, and also among themselves, by removing all partial faction.

"The procuring of some aid secretly for the Prince of Condé, if the French King will refuse to have the Queen a moderator of peace; as presently she hath sent to offer the same: whereof as yet no answer is had; but if it be refused,

\* The following passage from Rapin, seems to us to represent things in so just a light, that we cannot refrain from transcribing it. "The truth is, Mary was unhappy only in having too zealous adherents, who, by all their proceedings, pushed her more and more towards the precipice; but this is no wonder, they acted not for her sake, but for their own ends, and the interest of the Romish religion, to which she served for pretence. James Melvil, who was no enemy to Mary, observes in his Memoirs, that both the parties equally did her hurt; the one by acting directly against her, the other by serving her with too much zeal." Leslie, Bishop of Ross, very particularly her avowed minister and agent, by engaging in all the plots laid against Elizabeth, could not but induce the latter to suppose that he acted agreeably to his Mistress's inclinations and orders.

then is made apparent by themselves, that their intention is to prosecute the subversion of the common cause of religion.

“To view the power of the realm, and to put it in order (and especially the countries upon the sea-coast towards Flanders and France), by special Commissioners.

“To make the navy ready.

“To embrace such leagues as the Princes of Almain do offer for defence of religion.”

It is fortunate for the credit of this great Statesman, that we are able to look into the history of Europe at large, and thereby to judge of the real grounds of his apprehensions.\* Had he been, as we observed before, only endeavouring to excite *false* alarms, to give a colour to the harshness or severity of his *remedies*, as he called them, we might ask, how it happened, that things abroad, should seem so to concur as to bear him out in all his calculations of danger? Had there been no design on foot to overthrow Protestantism, and destroy the Reformers, we might ask, how so many foreigners should suddenly come across the water, as was the case this year, for refuge and safety? The very reception of whom, with any degree of hospitality, was sure to be resented by many of the Courts abroad.† And yet that they were well and hospitably received here, and by none more than the Secretary,‡ is notorious and indisputable. From the first dawn of the Reformation, England became an asylum for the persecuted of all countries, with a noble disdain of the anger of the persecutors. Thus, as Strype relates, Elizabeth was moved at this time, not only to receive with a friendly concern, the refugees of Flanders and France, but to send help to the

\* Montanus's History of the Spanish Inquisition, was published about this time, translated by Vincent Skinner, of Lincoln's-Inn, supposed by Strype to be *Secretary* to Sir William Cecil. There was surely some reason for such a publication, when, as it is stated in the preface, the Inquisition was come so near to England as the Low Countries.—See *Strype's Annals*, ch. liii.

† Of the Pope's resentment there can be little doubt. The following occurs in his famous bull, speaking of the encouragement given to the Protestants, “*adnitente inter cæteros flagitiorum serva Elizabetha prætensa Angliæ Regina, ad quam veluti ad asylum, omnium infestissimi profugium invenerunt.*”

‡ A very deserving man, Rodolphus Cavallerius (or Cavalier) a French Protestant, who had been in England in the reign of Edward VI., and thereby probably well known to the Secretary, was this year, by his means, and that of his worthy father-in-law, Sir Anthony Cook, and with the particular sanction of Archbishop Parker and Bishop Grindal, advanced to the Professorship of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, with a Prebendal stall at Canterbury.

professors of the Gospel, in the latter country, "chiefly by her Secretary CECIL, a man very cordial in the Protestant interest," of which, a letter still preserved from Theodore *Wierus*, an accredited agent of the Prince of Condé, is no small proof. It is addressed "Nobilissimo et illustri virtute, doctrina et rerum experientia Dnō Dnō Gulielmo CECYLIO, auratæ militiæ equiti, et sereniss. Anglorum Reginæ a secretis, &c.: dnō observando." It is written from Plymouth, in acknowledgment of the Secretary's great attention to the cause of Protestantism, on the eve of his departure for the Continent. Alluding to his support of the Prince of Condé, he says, "Mei officii esse existimavi, ut priusquam ex hac insula solverem, singulares tibi pro celsitudine illius gratias agerem." Owing, to adopt the close and correct translation of Strype, "That the illustrious Prince his master, and the whole French Church, were upon many accounts indebted to him, that with so great pains and study he had forwarded with the Queen, the business committed to him by that Prince; and that all whom God the Father had exercised at that time for the purer profession of his Son, had not only their hope but even their confidence in him; and that they looked upon him to be raised up by God, in those daily extremities of the poor Church, to use both his piety and his prudence in their behalf. That he, for his part, as often as he thought on the most Christian Queen's care and good will towards the scattered and afflicted Christians, so often he had an honourable and grateful remembrance of *him*, who seemed by the special will of God, to be added to the Queen in those most difficult times."\*

The Secretary, however, was not satisfied with these compliments and acknowledgments on the part of the Protestants; he was desirous of vindicating to the whole world, the course and measure of the Queen's proceedings: and to this effect an extraordinary letter is still to be seen amongst the Cecil MSS., addressed by the Secretary to one who had expostulated with him, Signor *Bertano*, at Rome; abstracts of which are to be found in Strype's *Annals*; one passage is very noticeable, as addressed to an Italian and member of the Church of Rome,

\* Mr. Turner, in his late publication of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, book ii. ch. xxvii. has made it very apparent that several of the English Nobility were at this time "*traitorously busy*," as he calls it, with the French Minister, to hinder the Queen's sending any succours to the Protestants abroad. Mr. Turner has had the advantage of consulting the MSS. of the French Ambassador *Fenelon*, in the hands of Mr. Murray; his information on these points is, therefore, very important; especially as his researches appear to have led him to this conclusion, that had *Cecil* not been thwarted and counteracted at *this time* by others, the Reformation in France would have prevailed.



in which the Secretary insists upon the care taken by the Reformers, to depart no farther from the Romish Church, than the strict letter of the Scriptures and ancient formularies rendered necessary, and to their apprehension indispensable. "In the mean season, I can assure you, whatsoever slanders are raised of us, for our errors in religion, or for our government in policy towards our neighbours, this I dare affirm, that by no common law or order established for matters of religion in this realm, we do differ from profession of all the parts of the Holy Scriptures, of the Articles of the common Creed ; yea, as for external discipline, I can assure you, our Church is more replenished with ecclesiastical ancient rites, than was the Primitive Church in five hundred years after Christ : insomuch as the Church of England is by the Germans, French, Scots, and others, that call themselves *reformed*, thought to be herein corrupted, for retaining so much the rites of the Church of Rome."\* This is entirely consistent with what we have before represented to be the true and exact spirit and design of the English Reformation, namely, not to discard more than was strictly necessary, upon the principle that under all its abuses and corruptions, much appertaining and belonging to the true Primitive and Catholic Church, was to be found among the Romanists. In this letter, the Secretary also justifies the Queen's proceedings with foreign powers, shewing her to be no wilful abettor of rebellious movements, as some pretended,† but a mediator to procure peace and a good understanding between all neighbouring princes and their subjects, and especially anxious to stay persecution ; but it must be admitted that it was difficult to do so, against the efforts of the Court of Rome, which was never perhaps more upon the watch to uphold its power and authority, by the suppression or annihilation of the Protestants, than at this time. This appears from a Latin letter still preserved, from Killegrew to the Secretary, dated *Romæ* die, xviii. Junij 69, to be seen in Strype's Annals, ch. liii., and from which it appears, that great anxiety was manifested at Rome, lest the King of France

\* I know not why Collier should accuse the Secretary as he does, of neither arguing the points, nor assigning the reasons for satisfaction in this letter ; I confess he seems to me to have done both.

† In a letter from Killegrew to the Secretary, dated from Hamburgh, May 25, 1569, he writes, "To make an end till farther occasion, I think the Queen's Majesty be more feared and honoured this day of all countries, what religion so ever they be of, than ever any of her Majesty's predecessors before her was. I beseech God her Highness do hold fast, and then I do not doubt but to see in her days, the ancient honour and fame of England restored again, to the glory of God, whom I beseech to preserve your Honour and all yours."

should conclude a peace, upon the proffered mediation of the Queen; the Pope enjoining prayers to be publicly offered up to God, to implore aid and assistance against all Hugonots. “*Galli hic negant regem accepturum conditiones pacis, Pontifex tamen id metuit, et publicis supplicationibus ad Deum jubet rogari victoriam adversus omnes Hugonottos.*”—And to shew how entirely his views were bent against the Protestants and Protestantism generally; of all people in the world to whom the annual compliment of a consecrated sword and hat were this year to be sent, that great tyrant and persecutor, the Duke of Alva, was particularly selected;\* while the Queen of England, by an extraordinary Bull, was anathematised and deprived of her kingdom, her subjects discharged from all bonds of allegiance, and as Bishop Jewel, in reply to this Romish fulmination, observed, imboldened to burn, spoil, rob, kill, and cut one another’s throats.†

We have no eager desire to dwell upon these things, but as the Jacobitical advocates of Queen Mary have chosen to make a mockery of the apprehensions of the great Statesman whose public life we are recording, and would fain load him and his Sovereign with the hateful charge of the most unprovoked persecution, rigour, and severity; common justice seems to demand, that in such an undertaking as the present, we should endeavour to rescue the truth from every false colouring, and do what justice we can to all parties. It is impossible to deny that Queen Mary’s was a most hard case; and had it not been notoriously mixed up with so many plots, cabals, and intrigues, against the peace of England, the security of Elizabeth, and the newly established Protestant Churches in Scotland and England, it might be extremely difficult to justify the steps taken against her, even up to this time. Strype, who always endeavours to set things in the plainest light, after speaking of the great expenses incurred by the Court in providing for Mary, adds, “But it is more material to relate the cause why Queen Elizabeth did thus detain her at this great cost to herself and her subjects. She was the chief head of the Frenchified and Popish Scots: by whose means the Guisian faction, that mortally hated the Queen, and were

\* The whole passage is curious: “*Pontifex singulis annis consecrat in festo natalis Christi gladium et pileum, quos mittit alicui principi, qui illi videtur bonam operam navare rebus pontificatus, hoc anno misit ista duo Albano (Albæ duci) quippe qui liberavit Belgium ab Hugonottis, et ob bellum feliciter gestum adversus Uranium [Aurangie principem] et est ratio quædam honestandi et admonendi principes ut acrius tueantur res pontificatus.*”

† See this Bull in Burnet’s Collections of Records, vol. ii. No. 13.

conjured together to invade her kingdom, and dethrone her, and overthrow the religion established, did hope to attain their ends, and therefore there was a necessity of keeping her in hold, (though at first the Queen did not intend it,\*) for her own safety and defence; besides the long jealousies between that Queen and Elizabeth, there is a letter of hers sent from Tutbury Castle, in March, to the Queen: wherein she doth in some places closely touch upon her in her expostulations, and even threaten her."

This is certainly, as it appears to us, a very true account of what we shall call the sad perplexities of this unhappy case. As for Mary's expostulations and threats, we may well admire the spirit that dictated them, but it does not follow that, in the extraordinary circumstances in which Elizabeth herself was placed, they were altogether deserved. In the beginning of this very year, Mary is alleged to have encouraged her party in Scotland, by many false charges against Elizabeth and her Council; the Secretary being the particular subject of one of her fabricated reports; it being affirmed that he and Murray had entered into a most extraordinary league, affecting the succession to both crowns. Murray, upon the setting aside Mary, and eventual death of her son without issue, to be heir of Scotland, and by marriage of a daughter of Cecil to the Earl of Hertford, the widower of the Lady Catherine Grey, to engraft the family of the Secretary on the Suffolk line, and thereby connect it with the crown of England; nor were there omitted surmises and insinuations of the removal, on both sides, of all intermediate claimants, as Mary herself and her son, and the two sons of Lord Hertford by Lady Catherine. These fabricated charges may be seen in an intercepted letter from Mary, in Haynes, 503, with Elizabeth's proclamation in refutation of such misrepresentations, p. 500, and Lord Hunsdon's correspondence with the Secretary, calculated to throw much light on the subject: in fact, the real cause of all Mary's troubles in England should be sought first in her communications with her Scottish and foreign friends, while comparatively at liberty;† and secondly, in her covert intrigues

\* See in Burnet, vol. ii. part ii. Sir Walter Mildmay's opinion concerning the keeping of the Queen of Scots, dated at Windsor Castle, Oct. 26, 1569. Collection of Records, No. 12. p. 512. N.B. A paper of considerable importance, as tending to shew the extreme difficulty of the case, as it regarded England, and the *small confidence* reposed in *Murray*, and other *opponents of Mary*, by *Elizabeth*, though she is often represented as constantly giving full credit to them *against Mary*.

† See Lord Hunsdon's letter from Berwick to the Secretary, Haynes, 523, date Sept. 18, 1569. "Her (the Q. of Scots) letters pass daily to and fro, encouraging such as hath taken her part to consist in the same, with many fair promises of rewards, and assurance to be in Scotland very



against Elizabeth, when under greater restraint. In this early stage of the business she certainly threw out many threats against Elizabeth, and no idle ones, if she could once have recovered her freedom; she had many more friends than Elizabeth, and all of them powerful friends, and the great wonder, to those who will give themselves the trouble to search deeply into the history of those times, is, not how Mary became a victim to the politics of her friends, but how Elizabeth could be preserved as *she* was preserved, on a *tottering* throne, for so many years, though for her credit, and the credit of her great Minister, we certainly wish it could have been free from the competition of the Scottish Queen; but the circumstances of Europe, which have never yet been sufficiently taken into the account, seem entirely to have forbidden this. It cannot, indeed, be denied that the royal captive did often regard the Secretary as her great enemy, and particularly on her removal to Tutbury this very year, which being in the neighbourhood of the Earl of Huntingdon (a presumptive heir to the crown of England), led her to apprehend some dark design in it, as she told Mr. White, who, in a letter to the Secretary himself, printed by Haynes, thus describes what passed in an interview he had just had with her: "She said nothing directly of yourself to me; but after supper, Mr. Harry Knollys and I fell into some close conference, and he, among other things, told me how loth the Queen was to leave Bolton Castle, not sparing to give forth in speech, that the Secretary was her enemy, and that she mistrusted by this removal, he would cause her to be made away; and that her danger was so much the more, because there was one dwelling very nigh Tutbury, which pretended title in succession to the crown of England (meaning the Earl of Huntingdon); but when her passion was past (as he told me), she said, that though the Secretary was not her friend, yet she must say that he was an expert, wise man, a maintainer of all good laws for the government of this realm, and a faithful servant to his mistress; wishing it might be her luck to get the friendship of so wise a man." It was always Mary's ill fortune, to have her personal accomplishments

shortly; and great threatenings to such as hath taken part against her, unless they recant; but if they will acknowledge their duty and allegiance to her, then for all faults past, *Remissionem Peccatorum*.

"Her principal messenger in this affair is Dan Car of Shylstock Braes, a common and notorious thief and murderer, and one of the killers of the scout of this town at my first coming. He saith that he has my Lord of Shrewsbury's passport. If I come by him ye shall hear both of him and his letters."

operate to her disadvantage, not merely as Elizabeth's rival in youth and beauty, as some pretend, but from the power they gave her over those who had access to her; the writer of the letter just referred to, saw the danger of this very fully. "But if I (which in the sight of God bear the Queen's Majesty a natural love beside my bounden duty) might give advice, there should very few subjects in this land have access to, or conference with this Lady; for beside that she is a goodly personage, she hath withal an alluring grace, a pretty Scotch speech, and a searching wit, clouded with mildness. Fame might move some to relieve her, and glory joined to gain might stir others to adventure much for her sake. Then joy is a lively infective sense, and carrieth many persuasions to the heart; which ruleth all the rest.\* Mine own affection by seeing the Queen's Majesty our Sovereign is doubled, and thereby I guess what sight might work in others. Her hair of itself is black, and yet Mr. Knolls told me, that she wears hair of sundry colours.

"In looking upon her cloth of estate, I noted this sentence embroidered, *En ma fin est mon commencement*; which is a riddle I understand not. The greatest personage in the house about her is the Lord of Levingston and the Lady his wife, which is a fair gentlewoman; and it was told me, both Protestants. She hath nine women more, fifty persons in household, with ten horses. (N. B. How different from Lochleven.) The Bishop of Ross lay then three miles off, in a town called Burton upon Trent, with another Scottish Lord. My Lord of Shrewsbury is very careful of his charge, but the Queen overwatches them all; for it is one of the clock at least every night ere she go to bed. The next morning I was up timely, and viewing the seat of the house, which in mine opinion stands much like Windsor, I espied two halberd-men without the castle wall, searching underneath the Queen's bed-chamber window.—Thus have I

\* That Mary had found many friends already in England besides the Catholics, is evident from the account given by Sir Nicholas Throckmorton of a discourse he had with her father-in-law, the Earl of Lennox, when walking with the Queen (Elizabeth) in her garden at Greenwich.

"The Earl said, that he marvelled that the Q. of Scots, a woman so ill thought of heretofore, began now to find friends, and to be favoured in England and Scotland. Whereunto he (Sir N.) answered, that three things, as he thought, did move that. The first her misery, whereof all men naturally take compassion: the second, her entertainment of such as came to her; and the third, the opinion that some had of her title in succession; whereunto there were exceptions, as there were to other titles, and as few to hers as to others. And both the Earl and he, in that conference, had this speech on both parts, that they prayed God to preserve the Queen's Majesty, for neither of them would be glad to live under the Queen of Scots."—*Haynes*, 548.

troubled your Honour with rehearsall of this long colloquy, happened between the Queen of Scots and me, though the greatest part of our communication was in the presence of my Lord of Shrewsbury and Mr. Harry Knolls."

That no small attention was at this time paid to Mary's high rank and station in life, we may conclude from the very circumstance to which Strype alludes at the beginning of the passage above cited, namely, her *Expenses*, which were a subject of complaint on the part of the Earl of Shrewsbury, addressed to the Lord Treasurer, whose interposition he requests, to put things upon a better footing. It may surprise the reader to be told that her Majesty bathed in wine; but among other things provided for her supply and accommodation by his Lordship, it is expressly stated, that the wine alone amounted to a considerable charge, "*for when she bathed, she bathed in wine;*" and afterwards, "*Two tun of wine a month hitherto would not suffice ordinarily; besides that was used at times for her bathing, and such like uses.*"\* Considering Elizabeth's known parsimony, such little incidents as these may serve to shew, that she was not regardless of the high condition of her prisoner, or sparing of expenses suitable thereto;† not *at first* that is; for we shall have to shew what were the probable causes of subsequent restraints and retrenchments, when the time arrives to speak of them. Already, however, as it would appear from the paper of Sir Walter Mildmay just referred to, one of the cautions recommended to be used, was, to diminish the number of her attendants, being then about *forty* persons [according to White's letter], to the one half, to make thereby the Queen's

\* See this letter in Lodge's *Illustrations of History*, vol. ii. 27. In Digges's *Compleat Ambassador*, p. 11, is to be seen a very curious statement of the gracious treatment of Mary, quite equal to, if not exceeding, her former state in Scotland.

† We shall mention another incident creditable to the feelings of Elizabeth, in Lodge's *Illustrations of History*. A letter from the Secretary to the Earl of Shrewsbury, dated from Greenwich, May 15, —69, begins thus:—

"Yesterday the Bishop of Ross gave me your Lordship's letter, containing the recovery of the Queen of Scots' health upon the peril wherein she was by receiving of certain pills. Her Majesty having knowledge by report of Mr. Candish [Cavendish], of the said Queen's peril, was very sorry, and so also glad of her recovery; and indeed it were good her physician were reproved in his audacity to put her in such peril, as I have heard he did the like heretofore."

The conclusion of this letter has also something courteous in it towards the unhappy prisoner: "Order is given to Carlisle to put to full liberty the Queen of Scots' servants; and surely the Deputy Warden doth it of some error, for on my faith I know not of any direction given him therein, and so I pray your Lordship to assure the Queen of Scots. "W. CECIL."



charges the less, and to give her the fewer means of intelligence. The conclusion of this curious memorial may serve to shew, how little an imprisonment of eighteen years, only to be terminated by a trial and execution, were contemplated at *that* time. See also Lord Sussex's letter to Sir William Cecil, April 25, 1570, in Lodge, vol. i. 40, with the editor's note. "That she be retained here until the estate of Scotland be more settled, and the state of other countries now in garboil be quieted, the issue whereof is like to be seen *in a year or two*."

I would observe that in the document immediately following Sir Walter Mildmay's opinion, and purporting to be a letter from Lord Leicester to the Earl of Sussex concerning the Queen of Scots, and marked, as well as the foregoing, No. 12, is to be found a most statesmanlike discussion of the Queen's great embarrassments as to the treatment of Mary; Lord Leicester's opinion on this occasion inclining to her release under conditions. And indeed it may be seen by the papers in Haynes, all preserved by Sir William Cecil, that in the month of March of this year, the Queen's party in Scotland were invited by the Regent to repair to Edinburgh, and join the Council, to frame such heads and articles as (upon acknowledgment of the King's authority) might redound to the Queen, their Sovereign Lord's mother's *honour, advancement, and commodity*; but this was defeated by the neglect of the Queen's party to fulfil their agreements, or acknowledge the King's authority.\*

In September, a special Messenger (Henry Carey) appears to have been sent from the Court to the Regent of Scotland, with the following inquiries and demands, from a minute by the Secretary.

"First, what assurance shall be given us by hostages, if the Q. of Scots be returned into Scotland, that she shall not be in danger of her life, but that she shall live her natural life without any sinister means to shorten the same; and the said Earl shall understand that the more hostages in number and greatness of title shall be given us, the more shall be our contentation for all respects."†

\* See Lord Hunsdon's letter to the Secretary, April 18, 1569, Haynes, 514. See also the copy of the Degreis sent by John Wood, p. 516, 517, indorsed by the Secretary.

† Of other treaties set on foot for her deliverance, a good account may be seen in Strype's Annals at the conclusion of ch. lvii, with the causes which prevented their being brought to any good end, extracted from the Secretary's own papers, vol. i. part ii. p. 383. The chief difficulties seem to have been occasioned by Mary's friends, who were constantly practising *underhand*, with the discontented of both countries and the foreign Catholic Governments, to the great peril of Elizabeth.—See also *Rapin* under the year 1570.

Demand is then made of six hostages at the least, three Earls and three Lords of Parliament, to remain in England, upon the charges of the crown of Scotland, as sureties that the Queen of Scots shall enjoy such estate, as by the Parliament of Scotland shall be granted to her, and that she shall continue the course of her natural life without any ill usage of her person to the danger thereof.

It is easy to say that this was all pretence, and a mere show to quiet those who were importunate for her release; and, indeed, it is stated at the beginning of the instructions given to Carey, that the urgency of the case arose out of the continual solicitations of the friends of that Queen to have something decided, and a choice made between the "sundry ways of proceeding" that had been "proposed;" but then we must consider, that Mary's own plan was to be removed to France, as appears from a letter to the Secretary written by the Earl of Huntingdon and Viscount Hereford, appointed assistants to the Earl of Shrewsbury, and dated only six days after the Instructions, in which it is stated, that Mary "still desired to go into *France*, where she now is in great hope to have aid, because, as she saith, the Admiral is overthrown."\* We rather wonder she should have allowed herself to say this, because the overthrow of the Admiral (*Coligni*), the death of his brother (*Andelot*),† and of the Duke of Deux-ponts, about this time, gave great advantage to the Catholic party, and to her relatives of the House of Lorrain, against the *Hugonots*, and furnished no small reason to the English Court to prevent her going to that country; this, however, might be the occasion of their consulting about her removal to Scotland, for it may still be very confidently asserted that her detention, besides the expenses attending it, was full of hazards to Elizabeth.

But to return to other matters; the Puritans were busy this year as usual, and fully as earnest to have the Reformation carried farther, as the Romanists were to have the old religion restored; an ignorant writer of this sect (for so he seems to have been from the style of his letter) particularly addressed the

\* Haynes, 532. From this letter it will be seen how strong a charge is brought against the Bishop of Ross (Leslie) of having misrepresented both Lords, and uttered a deliberate falsehood of the Viscount Hereford.

† In Strype's *Life of Bishop Grindal* it is stated that the Admiral and his brother were both poisoned by the Popish faction, and the villain that did it acknowledged that Catherine de Medicis the Queen set him on. The Admiral survived, but Andelot died; the Catholics imputed his death to a malignant fever, but it is more generally attributed to poison.—*Life of Grindal*, 203.

Secretary upon the subject in a paper which Strype has printed; his name was Christopher Foster, alias Colman.\* He professed to "write in zeal, love compelling him out of a simple heart." Offence was taken by others of the party at the encouragement given to dramatic performances, particularly at Court, wherein the children of the chapel often assisted, and appear to have been even formed into a regular company for such exhibitions. This occasioned a pamphlet to be put forth this year, entitled, "The Children of the Chapel stript and whipt;" in which is to be found the following remark: "Plaies will never be suppress whilst her Majesties unfledged minions flaunt it in silkes and sattens; they had as well be at their Popish service in the devils garments."†

Much as the Secretary's time was taken up (well or ill, for he often appears to have written letters in his bed) with state affairs, he was little less occupied with the concerns of the Church and Universities. Dr. Whitgift, then Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, seems to have had many occasions to apply to him this year from that seat of learning, particularly in regard to the admission of Westminster Scholars into that College, some having endeavoured to go beyond the statute; he was called upon to interpose in the appointment of a Master of St. John's College, where great feuds and animosities had arisen, beyond the power of the Visitor to appease; but Sir William was appealed to, as the natural and most acknowledged patron of that house, of which he had formerly been a member; Bishop Grindal particularly addressing him as such, at the conclusion of the business. At King's College also some differences had occurred, which were referred to him, after the Visitor had in vain endeavoured to settle them. These things may be seen in the Life of Whitgift by Strype, and cannot fail to evince the Secretary's constant and indefatigable attention to every thing relating to the peace and well-ordering of the nation, whether it regarded what was passing abroad, or at home. It is, in short, almost impossible to discover any transaction of a public nature, that was not after some manner or other submitted to his particular judgment and discretion; and though his office of Secretary might, in a great degree, account for the infinity of letters addressed to him, and still preserved in our several public repositories, yet it is remarkable how invariably in all such addresses there appears to be a direct appeal made to his individual decision, sentence, and determination.

\* See also Collier, ii. 522, 523.

† Nichols's Progresses, i. 488.



A very few things more remain to be noticed, as belonging to the year 1569. We ought not perhaps to pass over the death of Bishop Boner, who died this year in the Marshalsea prison, and under a sentence of excommunication. His incarceration does not appear to have been attended with any circumstances of extreme rigour; he is even said to have passed much of his time there in feasting and banqueting; nor was any advantage taken of his excommunication to exclude him from the rights of Christian burial, though the prudent Bishop Grindal wisely judged it expedient to direct his funeral to be at night, to save his remains from the resentment of the populace; some indignities, however, could not be entirely prevented. An account of all these things was regularly sent to the Secretary, in a letter from the Bishop, to be seen in Strype.\*

Another great enemy of the Reformation was this year also stopped in his career of hostility to the Church and the Queen's Government (but of whom we shall have more to say hereafter); this was Dr. Story, a furious bigot, who had most audaciously, in his place as a member of the House of Commons, professed to regret the *lenity* of the last government towards the Queen when Princess; and would have stirred up the Duke of Alva to invade the kingdom. It was in his service, indeed, that he was beguiled into an English ship in Flanders, and speedily conveyed over to the opposite shore. Of the great cruelties of himself and Boner, Strype has mentioned many particular instances after Fox, but we need not dwell on them here; it is very certain that they were both most relentless persecutors of the professors of the Gospel. Story was afterwards executed, claiming to be a subject of the King of Spain, and renouncing all allegiance to Elizabeth.†

This year was memorable for the first establishment of those foreign seminaries of Popish priests and jesuits, which contributed so much to the disturbance of the Queen's Government. The first College of this kind was founded at Douay,‡ under the express auspices, and at the particular charge of Philip, King of Spain; Dr. William Allen, an Englishman, afterwards made a Car-

\* Life of Grindal, 209.

† See Strype's *Annals*, ii. 124, 125, &c. for an account of his death and will.

‡ The College of Douay, for English refugee priests, was established in 1568, or 1569.—*Lingard*, 374. Strype seems, but I believe through inadvertence, to place this event several years later.—*Annals*, ii. 630. It was dissolved by Reguesens, while Governor of Flanders, but revived at Rheims in 1575, under the protection of the Cardinal of Lorrain, and returned to Douay in 1593. Similar colleges were founded at Rome in 1579, at Valladolid in 1589, at St. Omer in 1596, and at Louvain in 1606.—*Hallam*, 147.

dinal, being placed at the head of it. It was not till ten years afterwards, that the college at Rome, of which *Persons* was made the rector, was founded for the same purposes, namely for the breeding up English Missionaries, expressly to endeavour the restitution of the Pope's authority in this kingdom, by exciting differences among the Protestants, of which we shall have in the course of our history many instances to produce.

Among the measures adopted at this time, for the better security and defence of the kingdom, which required the most prompt and vigilant attention, we read of the first public Lottery being drawn this year, 1569 ; it consisted, we are told, of 400,000 lots, at 10s. each lot. The prizes were plate, and the profits were to be applied to the repair of the havens of the kingdom. It was drawn at the west door of St. Paul's Cathedral. The drawing is stated to have begun on the 11th of January, and to have been continued incessantly, day and night, till the 6th of May following. The proposals for this lottery were published in the years 1567, 1568.\* The prizes were previously exhibited at the house of the Queen's jeweller and goldsmith, Mr. Dericke, in Cheapside.

\* Maitland, after Stowe. In Mr. Ellis's collection of original letters, vol. ii. second series, are two letters from the celebrated Sir Thomas Gresham to Sir William Cecil, calculated, as the Editor has observed, to throw light upon the money transactions of the time of Queen Elizabeth ; one letter is of the date of 1568, the other of 1569. It is remarkable, that Sir Thomas appears to have regularly stipulated that all who advanced loans under his guarantee should be released from the statute of usury. Sir Thomas, probably, had often some hard bargains to make, when occasion arose for prolonging the time of payment. The ordinary rate of interest at this time was fixed by statute at ten per cent.

## CHAP. XI.

1570.

Twelfth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, began Nov. 17, 1569.

*A year of extreme danger—Strype's abstract, with remarks upon it—Bullinger on the Pope's Bull—Bacon, Cecil, Mildmay, and Sadler denounced as Evil Counsellors—Norfolk Rebellion—Wylson's Translation of Demosthenes dedicated to Lord Burghley—Cartwright excites disturbances—Opposition of the Puritans unreasonable—Lord Burghley, as Chancellor of Cambridge, much annoyed by them—Project of Marriage between Elizabeth and the Duc d'Anjou, afterwards Henry III.—Astrological calculations upon it—Death of the Regent Murray—Mission of Sir William Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmay to Mary Queen of Scots, at Chatsworth—Sir William Cecil made Lord Burghley—Bishop Ross congratulates him—Cecil's own account of his new honours—Death of Throckmorton—Grindal, Archbishop of York.*

STRYPE, in his celebrated work on the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth, begins his account of the year we are now entering upon in the following manner :—

“We are now arrived to the twelfth year of the Queen's reign; a year of extreme danger and apprehension to the Queen and the whole kingdom. For this year the Spaniard sent great store and provision of arms and ammunition into Scotland.\* This year the Bishop of Ross, a busy stirring factor for the Queen of Scots, stirred up that King, the French King, and the Pope, to rescue her by force and invasion. This year Pius V. caused a bull (more privately sent about, 1569) to be publicly set up in London against the Queen; which was daringly done by one Felton, upon the Bishop of London's palace gates.†

\* Of the plans formed against England, in Scotland, at this time, a good, and probably a very just account, may be seen in Rapin, who corrects Camden, and considers the incursion of the Scots and Carrs, which the latter historian is disposed to underrate, as only the beginning of a very complicated and widely extended plot.

† It was also set up in Paris on the very same day, viz. March 2d, but the servant of the English ambassador there (Walsingham) boldly tore it down. The French King professed to be extremely sorry that such an indignity should be offered to Elizabeth; and the Ambassador was taught rather to impute it to the Spaniards.—*Digges' Compleat Ambassador*, p. 49. It may be seen at length in Camden, and Collier, ii. 521. in English.



In which bull the Pope deprived her of all title to her kingdom, absolved her subjects from their oath of allegiance, and charged them not to obey her upon pain of his curse and excommunication. This year a new rebellion was ready to break out in Norfolk, had it not been timely discovered and prevented : for which several lost their lives : and the Papists this year were full of confident expectation of their *golden day*, as they called it : and divers wizards predicted strange things in their behalf."

If it were possible for the *English* reader to divest himself, for a short time, of the commiseration he must naturally entertain for the unfortunate Mary ; if it were possible to exculpate her as a party, even by implication, to these formidable preparations against his own country, he must surely be disposed to acknowledge, that nothing less than the utmost heroism on the part of Elizabeth, and the utmost skill and wisdom and resolution on the part of her counsellors, ministers, and servants, could have rescued the Crown, and the Kingdom, and the Church from the effects of such a coalition ; and if it should be said, that it might have been disarmed and dispersed at once, by the mere delivery of the captive Queen, the *ostensible* and certainly the *most plausible* cause of all these proceedings, such a conclusion would be ill supported by a just view of the angry state of Europe. Elizabeth, and England, and Scotland, and the Protestant Church of both countries, we will venture to say, would, by such a concession, only have been the more exposed to the resentment of all the Catholic powers. "It was no hard matter," says Rapin, "for Elizabeth to perceive that all her troubles proceeded wholly from the Queen of Scots. If peace and quiet could have followed the setting her at liberty, she would have done it very willingly ; but though Mary's adherents, and those who solicited in her behalf, pretended that they acted purely from a motive of compassion, and exclaimed against the injustice of detaining her in prison, Elizabeth was not ignorant that their views extended much farther. The *Pope*, *Spain*, the house of *Lorrain*, the Duke of *Alva*, the *English*, *Scotch*, and *Irish* Catholics, confined not themselves to the freeing the unhappy Queen from captivity, their aim was to set her on the throne of England. And therefore it was more dangerous for Elizabeth to release her, than to keep her confined." "She was a very dangerous rival, even when in prison ; how much more had she been at liberty ?" In another place the same author very sensibly observes, "I am persuaded that they, who have hinted that compassion for Queen Mary set her friends to work for her, had no true notion of the extraordinary plots and cabals

that were incessantly contriving on her account. I do not, however, deny that among those who served her, some acted from that motive ; but pity was not the swaying principle of those who managed affairs. These promoted Mary's restoration only as a means to execute greater projects." These are very sensible remarks, but indeed we have an admirable confirmation of them, in a letter from Bishop Leslie to Mary herself, in which, lamenting that she gave too much ear to the discontented in England, as well as to the *foreign* enemies of the latter, he says, " Who counsell things to be attempted by shew of friendship to your Majesty, albeit rather for their own particular pretences." *Murdin*, 56. See also *Cecil's* short memorial of the state of the realm, *Haynes*, 579 ; though this paper is called a short memorial, it is really a very long one, but deserves *great attention* ; for though it has been the fashion with some, to abuse the Secretary for these state papers, yet certainly no documents can throw more light on the actual history of things. It is easy to denounce his apprehensions as fictitious or groundless, because the things he apprehended did not come to pass, but this is not a right way of judging, when so many histories of Europe are extant to inform us of the true grounds on which his apprehensions rested. Those only can be proper judges of the memorials of this celebrated statesman, who can find time to peruse numerous volumes of contradictory history, and fairly separate the truth, from the false colourings and inveterate prejudices of party writers. It was not the deliverance of Mary, so much as the advantages to be derived from her title to the English crown, her known Catholicism, and her attractive powers, of which her pretended friends were anxious to avail themselves, only to further their own purposes. Resistance, a desperate resistance indeed, as to all present appearances, was Elizabeth's only resource ; as all the well disposed part of her subjects seem to have thought and felt ; when at the conclusion of the year (we must anticipate a little), on her escape from these tremendous difficulties, extraordinary signs of joy and triumph were in all parts exhibited, and the day of her accession to the throne, the memorable 17th of November, marked as a solemn annual festival, in commemoration of her deliverance, and called by some, with an emphatic allusion to the complicated dangers which had been averted, ' The BIRTH-DAY OF THE GOSPEL.'

We cannot wonder that Mary's sad story should alienate the minds of any persons of sensibility from Elizabeth, as the story is *commonly* told, but it is not doing the latter common justice, to speak of her upon *all* occasions with such malignity as some authors do. Thus, after as fully enumerating all the

dangers to which Elizabeth stood exposed at this period as Strype himself, Dr. Gilbert Stuart coolly says, "All the tormenting jealousies of her nature were awakened, and she resolved to avert the machinations of the Popish potentates with intrigue and address." Is this a fair way of speaking of a *great* Queen (for so she certainly was), against whom plots were hatching in all directions, and who stood exposed to all the vengeance of a Popish bull of excommunication and dethronement? Was she to be excluded from defending herself with the very weapons employed against her? was she to be expected to survey with no jealousy the machinations of a whole host of Popish potentates, who had insulted her from the moment of her accession to the crown, and were continually denouncing her as a bastard, an usurper, an heretic, and the greatest dissembler upon earth, when there were hundreds and thousands as false as ever she could be? It is very remarkable, but quite true, that while Elizabeth is in the most vulgar manner (we can say no less of Whitaker's coarse defence of Mary) vilified and abused for her resentment of Mary's pretensions to her Crown, they reckon it among the *praises* of Mary, that "she sheweth a great desire to be avenged of her enemies; she sheweth a readiness to expose herself to all perils in hope of victory." There cannot be said to be much of Christian charity or feminine weakness (or "miliness of mind," to use one of Mr. W's own expressions,) contained in this encomium.—See *Whitaker*, second edit. vol. i. 27. Anderson is the author cited by Whitaker,\* and a note is subjoined from Knox, on the very words, as a striking instance of "her readiness to expose herself to all perils in hope of victory." In the contest with Murray, after her marriage with Darnley, Knox writes, "She and the army early in the morning, long before the sun was risen, began to march, but there arose such a vehement tempest, as the like had not been seen before of a long time, and the raging storm being in their faces, with great difficulty went they forward; and albeit the most part waxed weary, yet the Queen's courage increasit manlike so much, that she was ever with the foremost—divers were drowned in the waters of the Carron." We do not copy this in dispraise of Mary, but to shew that she could be upon occasion as "manlike" as her great rival; and yet half the excuses made for her yielding herself to Bothwell are, that the latter had imposed upon a *weak* and *timid* woman. "*Foible et timide*," are the very words used by

\* The expressions are all to be found in a letter from Sir Francis Knollys to Secretary Cecil, dated Carlisle, June 11, 1568, and printed by Mr. Ellis in the 2d vol. of his *Original Letters*, first series, p. 246.



Mad<sup>de</sup>. de Keralio, and directly afterwards, “*La crainte, la timidité, la mauvaise honte l’entraînoient rapidement à sa perte.*” Though the same author refers to Knollys’ letter to *Cecil*, in which he says, that there were two failings which *Mary* could not pardon, even in her friends: “*la foiblesse et la lâcheté*; vices, disoit *elle*, [*Marie*] dignes d’un profond mépris.” But to return.

The state of things in fact was so alarming to Elizabeth at this time, in which she was led to regard *Mary*, as she often declared (and not without reason, as Robertson admits), as the *hidden* cause of all, that she could not avoid perceiving that the detaining her any longer in England would be made the pretext or occasion of perpetual cabals and insurrections at home, as well as of hostile attempts from abroad; and she is alleged, in consequence of this, to have entertained serious thoughts of delivering her up to Murray,\* had not the Bishop of Ross, together with the French and Spanish Ambassadors, “remonstrated against the infamy of such an action, and represented the surrendering the Queen to her rebellious subjects, to be the same thing, as if Elizabeth should, by her own authority, condemn her to instant death.” Whether this conclusion were well founded or not, we may surely be allowed to take advantage of it thus far (considering the unpopular side we are taking in this great question), to observe, in justice, we think, to Elizabeth and her principal advisers, that as long as Elizabeth did *not* deliver *Mary* up to her rebellious subjects, she was the protector of her life, at *her own great hazard*, and to her *continual annoyance*. Elizabeth’s purpose, however, is said to have been put aside by the untimely death of the Regent Murray, who, at the very *beginning* of this year, according to our mode of reckoning,† was shot through the body by a musket-ball, as he rode along the streets of Linlithgow.

This foul deed being perpetrated by an *Hamilton*, nephew of the Archbishop of St. Andrew’s, it would seem scarcely possible to acquit that family of being privy to the transaction, especially as certain movements against England at the same time seemed strongly to confirm it. The Archbishop indeed is said to have acknowledged it on his death-bed; and it was certainly from the window

\* In exchange for the Earl of Northumberland.

† 1569-70, Jan. 23. On this very day it seems *Mary* had liberty to correspond with her son and friends in Scotland, by special messengers, under a free passport from Elizabeth. See her letter to Lord Sussex, *Haynes*, 575. We do not adduce this, as tending to connect her with the death of Murray, but to shew that she was not under such cruel restraint at this time as her advocates pretend.

of one of his houses that the ball was fired. The murderer escaped on a horse belonging to John Hamilton, Abbot of Arbroath, one of the sons of the Duke of Chatelherault, and his first course was to Hamilton, where Calderwood relates that he was "received with great applause." More private and personal motives however have been assigned for the perpetration of the deed, particularly an arbitrary seizure of an estate by Murray, the loss of which, with some harsh treatment, had driven his lady mad, and worked the assassin up to this bloody resentment of his wrong; it seems very certain, however, that after the battle of Langside, he had had his life given him by the Regent when ordered for execution.\*

It would lead us much too far, to attempt to give such a character of Murray, as might be satisfactory to the world at large. Collier, very shortly, but very truly has said, "as to the character of the Earl of Murray, it is very differently drawn;" and Robertson says much the same. No character perhaps in the records of modern history, as the last author seems to confess, was ever *more* differently drawn; with some writers, reaching from his own to the present times, he passes for a monster of iniquity, with others he is as highly extolled;

\* We have already noticed a curious contradiction in Whitaker, the most *furious* advocate of Mary; where he speaks of "the milkiness of her mind," after having just *praised* her (for so it seems) for the great desire she shewed generally to be "*avenged of her enemies*." The following is another instance of his great discrimination of characters: "Murray," says he, "must have long trafficked in villany, as he had long maintained a connexion with her [Elizabeth], before he could have risen to such a pitch of familiarity, with the *evil spirit* within her as to *think* of making her such an overture—but he knew her too well, to be afraid of any virtuous resentment from her. Associates in enormity always pay that compliment to goodness, to have the strongest *contempt* for one another." But having to *dispraise* Elizabeth, for her intimacy with *Murray*, he introduces a note in the very same page from the French minister Fenelon, to shew, that instead of the *contempt* she *might be expected to have felt for such a villain*, she shut herself up in her chamber on hearing of his death, *very seriously lamenting* his loss, as indeed she had reason to do. Elizabeth never is right, with Mary's friends, especially in comparison with the latter. The tears shed by the former, are judged by them to have been but the expressions of concern and vexation for the loss of an *accomplice in cruelty and wickedness*; whereas nothing but mercy and piety could shine through all the actions of Mary. "La Reine Marie," says one of her encomiasts, "n'apprit point avec joie la mort de son persecuteur. Son ame *pieuse et sensible* ne parut frappé que d'une mort si soudaine, qu'il n'avoit pas eu le temps de se repentir de ses crimes envers Dieu, sa patrie, et sa soeur, ella donna des larmes à sa mort, s'occupa du salut d'un homme qui l'avoit traité avec tant de barbarie, et demanda à Dieu, pour lui, misericorde et clemence." And yet there is no event in history better certified, than that Mary had projected his assassination on his return to Scotland in 1568.

of which the following is a remarkable specimen: "He was," says Archbishop Spottiswood, "a man truly good, and worthy to be ranked amongst the best governors that this kingdom [Scotland] hath enjoyed, and therefore to this day honoured with the title of the GOOD REGENT." It is true, we are told that the word "*Good*" in *this* instance, does not mean good in its common sense, but *gude* or "godly;" and *that* rather as a *nickname* to mark his connexion with the Scottish Reformers; the *godly* set, as they were rather *scornfully* called by their opponents; but surely Archbishop Spottiswood at all events knew, that whether it meant "good" or "godly," in English or Scotch, it was adopted in praise of him, as Regent or Governor of the realm; and certainly, from all we have read, we are quite disposed to think, that if he were overpraised by some, he was shamefully calumniated by others. Instead of crowding our pages however with formal references to the several authors who have spoken ill or well of this celebrated Statesman, and whose contradictions of each other, as proofs of party spirit, it has been quite painful to us to peruse and compare, we are happy to be able to refer the reader to a modern work, often before cited, *McCrie's* Life of Knox, where may be seen a long note upon the subject, marked W, vol. ii. p. 332. concluding with two testimonies in his favour, which we think it would be very difficult wholly to set aside.

The one is the character given of him by the celebrated French historian De Thou, [*Thuanus*], in *reply* to *Camden*; collected from the concurrent opinions of the friends and enemies of the Regent while he was alive, and with whom that celebrated historian had actually conferred on the subject; on the strength of the information he had thus personally obtained, and in defiance of all calumniators, he pronounces him to have been "a man without ambition, without avarice, incapable of doing an injury to any one, distinguished by his virtue, affability, beneficence, and innocence of life!" It is true, some say, his character *latterly* was much altered, but if we attend to the professed advocates of Mary he was *never* good; *always* artful, intriguing, ambitious, and even blood-thirsty! an apostate, a rebel, a murderer, and we know not what beside.

The other testimony publicly borne to his virtues, is the inscription on his Monument in the old Church of St. Giles, Edinburgh, and which asserts it to have been erected, "by his grieving country, as to a common father."—An inscription of which, surely, the best of Kings might have been proud; and indeed he was the son of a King who possessed many amiable qualities, and, as we have shewn in our first volume, stands commemorated in his native king-



dom and country, as “The poor man’s friend.” Mary is also said to have been naturally amiable, and perhaps from the flow of the *same royal blood* in her veins, but unhappily, with a mixture of *Guisian* blood, which did her no service, in the then state of Europe, and particularly in Scotland and England. It was *good* blood, as far as regarded the shining qualities of bravery, talents, high spirit, and courtly manners; but tintured with bigotry, insatiable ambition, a hatred of the Reformation and all Reformers, and a blind devotion to the see of Rome—so fatally distinguished from each other were the brother and sister of one and the same father. It was the fate of Murray however to become so prominent an actor in the *Marian Tragedy*, during which, it must be confessed, he was continually in habits of intercourse or correspondence with Lord Burghley, that we cannot help acknowledging ourselves to have been under some serious anxiety, to rescue his fame, as far as possible, consistently with truth, from the venomous shafts and bitter malice of his most inveterate enemies, the modern advocates of Mary. As a *Statesman* it was impossible for Lord Burghley not to have had much to do with Murray, let his character have been what it might, and we may surely be allowed to add, that considering the great object at stake, the real and essential interests of Scotland were undoubtedly safer in Murray’s hands than they could have been in those of Mary and her *foreign* connexions.

On the Earl of Murray’s death, intrigues were set on foot in Scotland to unite all parties against England; while on the part of England, of course, great anxiety was shewn to prevent a union which threatened to be fatal to the repose of the southern half of the island, and to procure a new Regent to be appointed, attached to the King’s Government and the alliance with England; an object that seemed to be accomplished by the appointment of the Earl of Lennox, the King’s grandfather, to that high station. But to return.—

The bull of Pius V., of which we had occasion to speak, and which was speedily and ably answered by Bishop Jewel, found also at this time another zealous opponent, in the person of the very celebrated and amiable Swiss Minister, Henry *Bullinger*, of Zurich, who undertook the defence of Elizabeth and the whole realm; and with such admirable success and strength of argument, that though it was judged in some degree imprudent to make the bull too generally known, Bullinger’s defence was afterwards printed and published. In the mean while a letter was sent to him, written by the Secretary’s great friend, Cox, Bishop of Ely, who told him, “That the Queen should know his

good-will to her and her kingdom ; and that he would take care, that she, who well understood both Latin and Greek, should take a pleasant taste of his book.\* The whole letter, copied from the original at Zurich, may be seen in Strype, among the papers at the end of the first volume of his Annals, marked H ; and an able account is given in the text, of some of the chief heads of Bullinger's answer ; which, in fact, reaches back to the commencement of our English Reformation, plainly shewing how closely Elizabeth was treading in the steps of her worthy brother King Edward VI.

It seems to be the peculiar lot of statesmen in power, to derive credit, and perhaps the most just as well as the highest credit, from the very abuses heaped upon them by the enemies of themselves and their country. From the enumeration we have given above, of the complicated designs on foot against the Queen and her dominions, it may easily be supposed, that the particular Counsellors who, in defence of both, exerted their talents to thwart such dangerous purposes, must have become the most prominent object of the resentment of their adversaries. To hasten the downfall and destruction of any ancient building, what so sure or so necessary as to get the buttresses removed ? This may be said to have been the case with the Court of England, at this time ; it became a great and continual subject of complaint, that the Queen was *surrounded with evil Counsellors*, and it can be no wonder that the most vigilant, wise, and faithful of those Counsellors should be among the first to incur such obloquy. In the month of May, of this year, certain libellous publications, professing to come from Scotland, whither the Queen had found it necessary to send an army, or at least to the frontiers of that disturbed country,† were put forth, and circu-

\* "Equidem diligentissime curabo, ut Regina nostra, et Græce et Latine doctissima, intelligat tuam erga ipsam studium et benevolentiam ; efficiamque ut tui libelli gustum capiat suavissimum."

Cox, speaking of the bull, against which Bullinger had so ably written, calls it "*terrificam illam bullam, quavis bulla vaniorem.*"

† Upon the murder of Murray, a party of Scottish borderers under Thomas Ker of Fernihurst, and Walter Scot of Buccleugh, broke into England and committed great ravages, meaning to provoke a war with Elizabeth, which Mary's party judged to be the surest way to unite Scotland ; but this was artfully turned aside by Elizabeth, who declined resenting it as a *national* affront, and sent Randolph to say so, urging the King's party to support the Protestant Church, and existing government. If there were *trick* in this, (see *Gilbert Stuart*, ii. pp. 1, 2.) it could only be regarded, as in other cases, as *trick for trick*. It gave Elizabeth a power and opportunity of sending forces into Scotland to strengthen the King's party, at the very time that the opposite party was prepared to attack them ; being encouraged thereto by a French Minister *Verac* who

lated with no small diligence, denouncing by name the four following eminent and distinguished Statesmen : the Lord Keeper (Bacon), Secretary CECIL, Sir Walter Mildmay, and Sir Ralph Sadler. These great men were represented to be the causes of all the dangers of which they complained; that they *misgoverned* the state and *abused their Sovereign*. It is possible for ourselves, though we come so much after them, to judge perhaps more correctly of these charges, than those who set them on foot; even if they had not been particularly interested in putting a false colouring on the acts of the English ministry, which those who are versed in English history must know to have been the case; had they been only abusing their Sovereign, misgoverning the state, and miscalculating the dangers with which both were threatened, we might well ask, How has it happened, that the reign of Elizabeth should have been ever since regarded as the particular æra of English glory? We might well wonder how it came to pass, that the fame of these *evil-disposed* Counsellors,\* should continue to our own days, while the very names of their detractors have, generally speaking, long sunk into oblivion. Mere detraction, however, was not sufficient; for in the county of Norfolk, a regular rebellion was upon the eve of breaking out, in which it was actually proposed to *seize the persons* of the Lord Keeper, and his brother-in-law, Secretary CECIL, and to invite the Duke of Alva to invade the kingdom. As this rebellion was checked, we need not enter into the particulars, much less enlarge upon it, especially as Strype, and other historians, have given a sufficient account of it; but we must observe, that it was rather to the credit of the inhabitants of that great county, that they should have taken so lively an interest, as seems to have been the case, in the fate of the Duke, who took his title from thence; for though a very mistaken and imprudent man in regard to his own concerns, he was on many accounts a Nobleman highly to be respected. It might be absurd to say, or to pretend, that this was the cause of the projected rebellion; but it is very certain that the people of Norfolk strongly resented the imprisonment of that unfortunate Nobleman, and looked to his

always pretended to be sent to reconcile matters, but whose real design was to overthrow the King's friends, and ultimately Elizabeth. We have before referred to Rapin's account of this manœuvre.—Had Elizabeth resented the incursion as an act of the *nation*, Verac might have succeeded in uniting both parties against England, but only as a preparative for the introduction of French and Spanish forces, and the excitement of the Catholics in both parts of the island. The English troops, under Sussex in the east, and Sir William Drury in the west, took a severe (indeed too severe a) revenge, burning and destroying many villages and castles.

\* Strype, speaking of the animosity of the Papists towards the Secretary, calls him, "The Queen's faithful and able Counsellor, who, for his wisdom and stability to religion, *was hated by them.*"



release as one great object of their movements.\* He was in truth much to be pitied, as having fallen, inadvertently as it would seem, into a vortex of most suspicious intrigues. The sum however of the projected Norfolk rebellion seems to have been, "to destroy the Queen's person, to imprison the Lord Keeper, the Earl of Leicester,† and Secretary CECIL, to set at liberty the Duke of Norfolk, and banish all strangers."

While one party (if a whole host of widely dispersed enemies may be called one party) was loading the Secretary with the heaviest abuse, as an enemy both to his country and his Sovereign, there were not wanting those, who viewed his conduct in a totally different light, who knew how to appreciate properly his extreme vigilance and circumspection, and his patriotic jealousy of one of England's greatest enemies. This appeared, from a book published about this time, by a very eminent scholar, Dr. Wylson, a civilian, and who afterwards became

\* The following letter from the Duke himself to the *Secretary*, August 5, 1570, might induce some surprise, that the latter should be so much an object of their resentment. It may be the more proper to notice it, as there is a letter to be seen in *Lodge*, vol. ii. No. liii. addressed to the Countess of Shrewsbury, giving an account of the trial of the conspirators, in which the Secretary is stated to have been accused of being the author of the Duke's imprisonment, by a relative of the name of Thomas Sicell. The truth probably is, that as far as he could, consistently with his duty, alleviate the sufferings of the Duke, he was never backward to do so.

"The Duke of *Norfolk* to Secretary *Cecill*. (Haynes, 601.)

"How great friendship I have received at your hands, good Mr. Secretary, you shall perceive at our next meeting; which I assure shall never be forgotten of my part. I pray God that at any time occasion may serve, that you may perceive how ready I will be to requite the same; my mind nor my health requireth any further liberty than I already enjoy: I think myself most bound to her Majesty for the same. It is no small comfort to me to be rid out of yonder pestilent infectious houses, which I fear will grow worse before it mend. And so committing the rest to the credit of this bearer, with my most hearty commendations to your good Lady, who, I dare undertake, is not less glad of this my ease of liberty, with most hearty commendations and thanks to yourself, I end this 5th of August."

"Yours never more beholden,

"To my loving friend Sir William Cycell, Knt.,  
principal Secretary to the Queen's Majesty."

"*NORFOLK*."

† This may perhaps have been the cause of the movements at Kenilworth, which Leicester began now to fortify, and to replenish with arms and other instruments of defence. "Thei say my Lord of Leicester hathe many workemen at Kyllingeworthe to make his howse stronge, and doth furnish it with armour, munition, and all necessaries for defence."—Letter to the Countess of Shrewsbury, August 31, 1570. *Lodge*, ii. 45.—Some however have supposed he had it in view to resent and interrupt the proceedings on foot for the marriage of the Queen, of which we shall soon have to speak.

Secretary of State. His work consisted of a translation of some of Demosthenes' Orations,\* directed against the tyranny and overbearing interference of Philip of *Macedon*, many passages of which were judged to be strikingly applicable to the particular circumstances in which England stood at that time, and the danger to be apprehended from his namesake of *Spain*; and the book, on these accounts, was very seasonably and properly dedicated, in a long epistle, to Sir William CECIL, the "learned Secretary," as the author himself calls him, and to whom he had previously sent a copy for his judgment, before he ventured to publish it. In the title-page it was stated to be "most needful that these Orations should be made public, that in such dangerous days they might be read of all men that loved their country's *liberty*, and were desirous of taking warning for their better avail by the example of others;" and the more to elucidate the purport of this title-page, he thus speaks of the Grecian Orator in another part of his book: "He that loveth his country, and desireth to procure the welfare of it, let him read *Demosthenes*, and he shall not want matter to do himself good. For he that seeketh common quietness, *Demosthenes* can teach him his lesson. He that would gladly prevent evil to come, *Demosthenes* is for his purpose. He that desireth to serve his country abroad, let him read *Demosthenes* day and night, for this is he that is able to make him fit to do any service for his country's welfare; for never did glass so truly represent a man's face as *Demosthenes* doth shew the world to us. And as it was then, so it is now, and will be so still, till the consummation and end of all things."

The Secretary could not escape trouble from the course of domestic affairs, any more than from the disturbances of Europe at large.—His high office of Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, exposed him greatly to the remonstrances, and counter-remonstrances, of the Puritans and their opponents. The celebrated Thomas Cartwright began now to take a very prominent part, not only against the ceremonies and discipline of the Church, but against the government of it; objecting, in no very measured terms, to the ministerial distinctions; as of Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, &c.—declaring, that they were

\* In which he appears to have made great use of the very elegant Latin translation by Sir John Cheke, the Secretary's learned relative, of whom we have had so much to say in our former Volume. In Dr. Wylson's book, great commendations are justly bestowed upon him; and a saying of Sir John is specially recorded, with regard to Demosthenes, to the following effect—"That none ever was more fit to make an Englishman tell his tale praiseworthy in any open hearing, either in parliament, pulpit, or otherwise, than this orator alone was."

all no better than "*officia et nomina impietatis*," offices and names of impiety. Various other objections were started, and not a little encouraged, so that the Secretary was urged by the heads of the University over which he presided, and by the Vice Chancellor, Dr. Chaderton, in particular, to look to these things; the conclusion of the Vice Chancellor's address to the Secretary, is in the following terms: "Jesus Christ, for his infinite mercy's sake, deliver us in these dangerous days, and grant you long life and power to be a patron of his glory." Grindal also, now Archbishop of York, wrote to the Secretary, urging him to take a speedy course against Cartwright; and to devise some means of silencing him, lest the youth there should be corrupted.\* The Chancellor was not inattentive to these communications, but Cartwright was not very easily to be silenced, his party in the place being very strong, and himself a man of very considerable talents. We have before endeavoured to express our sense of the impropriety of this opposition to the settled state of the Church; had the great revolution on foot been, as the Papists pretended, an attempt to set up an entirely new Church, and introduce novelties, in discharge of all that was ancient or approved, either in the doctrine or discipline of the Church of Rome, the case might have been different. As good and anxious subjects of the state, upon such an emergency, those who had imbibed a fondness for the *Helvetian* principles, might have been justified in at least offering their *opinions* as to the precise form of the *new* Church; but as the true spirit of the English Reformation was, to *preserve* as well as *discard*; to restore what had been departed from, rather than to break all union whatsoever, and to fix on a standard of authority which *none* could dispute, but which could not in reason be said of any merely human authority, the great question was, how much might be harmlessly *retained*?† It is vain to attempt to deny that Episcopacy had sub-

\* See this letter in Collier, ii. 525, introduced there, as the author states, to clear that most reverend Prelate from all imputations of Puritanism.

† "Malgré l'opposition qui existoit entre les principes de l'Eglise Catholique et ceux de l'Eglise Anglicane, la prudence d'Elizabeth, avoit conduit la Réformation d'une manière plus modérée qu'on ne l'avoit fait en aucun pays de l'Europe. La hiérarchie, la liturgie, les ceremonies anciennes *transmises d'âge en âge depuis les premiers siècles de l'Eglise*, et consacrées par la veneration des peuples, avoient été *conservées*, à quelques légers changemens près dans, les formes, qui ne pouvoient subsister en entier, puisque le fond n'étoit plus le même."—Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio. The same writer, speaking of those who objected to the habits, ceremonies, and hierarchy, says, "Imitateurs de Calvin, ils vouloient ramener la Reformation à la *grossièreté des siècles barbares*."



sisted in the Church from the earliest days,\* nor was it the Episcopal character of the Pope that was objected to by the English Reformers, but his assumption of an universal over-ruling inspection and authority, above all other Bishops, as *Bishop of Rome*. The contest seemed therefore to be reduced to this simple question, what might lawfully be retained, on the footing of the Scriptures, and the primitive forms of Church government? Now, as this remains a question, even to the present times, between Episcopalians and Presbyterians, we certainly need not enter into the dispute, further than to say, that those who, at the time of which we are writing, decided in favour of Episcopacy, had a just right so to do, as well as to assign the boundary where all *necessary* reformation might stop. In separating from Rome, the Church of England was under no obligation to take her model from Geneva, or any other country; and therefore to endeavour to force the platform of the former upon the nation, to the overthrow of the retained hierarchy, was certainly a violent, not to say an audacious step. It cannot however be denied, that on both sides much talent was displayed; Cartwright himself being a man of great learning and eminence. He had distinguished himself at Cambridge, when the Queen visited that University in the year 1564, and in the present year had been chosen the Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity. Unfortunately, in one of the earliest of his lectures, he entered largely into the subject of Church discipline, wherein he displayed so strong a bias against the established hierarchy, as very naturally to stir up considerable dissensions, and throw the whole University into a flame, though very respectable testimonials were certainly obtained, of the temperate manner in which he urged his objections.†

\* David Blondel's book, entitled, "Apologia pro Sententia Sancti Hieronymi de Presbyteris et Episcopis," though written in favour of Presbyterianism, closes with the following passage: "By all that we have said to assert the rights of Presbytery, we do not intend to invalidate the ancient and apostolical constitution of Episcopal pre-eminence; but we believe, that wheresoever it is established, conformably to the ancient canons, it must be carefully preserved; and wheresoever, by some heat of contention or otherwise, it hath been put down or violated, it ought to be reverently restored." Blondel's book was brought forward by the *Scottish Presbyterians*, at the Westminster Assembly, but the passage above *suppressed*; which causing a great camour, induced John Blondel, the author's brother, then in London, to write to David about it, who acknowledged the passage to be genuine.

† Strype's Annals, vol. ii. part i. p. 2., and see p. 3. an abstract of Cartwright's own letter to Cecil, accompanying the above testimonials. The letter itself, in elegant Latin, may be seen in Strype's Appendix.

The high situation of Chancellor appears constantly to have involved the Secretary in these disputes : \* appeals were poured in upon him from *both* sides, and he was called upon to decide upon points which fell not very regularly under his cognizance. † It is impossible to read his letters, or reflect upon the course he judged it right to pursue, without being struck with the diffidence with which he approached the subject, the great concern he appears to have felt that it should so much disturb the peace of the society over which he had to preside, and the candour and moderation with which he seemed anxious to treat those who, by an excess of zeal, were in danger of transgressing the laws. He so far, however, interposed, as to forbid Cartwright any more discussing these questions in his lectures and sermons till further order ; prohibiting, at the same time, the other party from doing the like.

All that passed upon this occasion, in the course of the present year (1570), is so circumstantially recorded in Strype's Annals, Collier's, and other histories, that it is unnecessary to go at large into the subject here ; it may be sufficient to observe, that the contention ran so high, as to terminate in the removal of Cartwright from his Readership in Divinity, and soon after from his Fellowship in Trinity College. ‡ The sum of his particular and avowed tenets is to be found in *six* Propositions signed by him, and forwarded to the Chancellor by Whitgift, then Vice Chancellor, § and other Heads of Houses [Annals of the Reformation under

\* He was, however, earnestly requested to exert himself also in behalf of the *Irish* Church, where the cures were said to be ill supplied, in consequence of the numerous impropriations in the hands of the Crown. The Archbishop of Dublin expressly wrote to him upon this. See Collier, ii. 528.

† The decision of the matter he left a good deal to the Heads of Colleges, but so far from declining to examine into it, as far as he reasonably could, he particularly requested Whitgift to supply him with a statement of Cartwright's peculiar tenets, and much encouraged that learned divine to answer and confute such as he judged objectionable. The letters addressed to the Chancellor may be seen in the Appendix to the 2d volume of Strype's Annals.

‡ Strype's Annals, ch. i. vol. ii. p. 5. The judicial proceedings may be seen in the Appendix to Strype's Life of Whitgift, No. ix.

§ In Strype's Life of Whitgift, b. i. ch. iv. (and in his Life of Parker, b. iv. ch. iv.) may be seen an account of the new statutes framed at this time for the University of Cambridge, with the Chancellor's consent. These new statutes gave great offence to the Puritanical party, one of whom, a man of good name and family, Edward Dering, sometime Fellow of Christ's College, took upon him greatly to censure Whitgift for the part he had taken in them, and even the Chancellor, for allowing them, in a letter particularly addressed to the latter ; which may be seen

Q. Elizabeth, ch. lvii. p. 380.], and in *twenty* additional and very censurable articles, pp. 381, 382. [See Collier.] The name of *Puritan*, it may be observed, bestowed on this party, of which Cartwright was the head, was designed to refer as much to their outward personal demeanour, as to the strictness of their discipline, or any peculiarity of doctrine. Whitgift, the great opponent of Cartwright, and afterwards Archbishop, compares them with the Pharisees, from their studied austerity of manners, their straining at little things,\* and their rude contempt of those who differed from them. But for the general manners of his followers and adherents, Cartwright would not acknowledge himself to be responsible.†

In the course of this year a negotiation was set on foot for the Queen's marriage with the Duc d'Anjou, brother of the King of France; *Cecil*, in a letter to Walsingham, at Paris, expresses his private opinion to be, generally speaking, that "he saw no continuance of the Queen's quietness without a marriage." And this, indeed, he might well say, the chances of the succession, after her death without issue, being made a continual trouble to her, especially by those who wished to have Mary Queen of Scots' title openly and publicly allowed;

in the Appendix to Strype's Life of Parker, No. 78; see also Collier, ii. 537, and for some of Dering's peculiar tenets, see *ib.* p. 532. In his letter to the Chancellor are some odd passages: "You have of late sent unrighteous statutes to Cambridge.—I am sorry, Sir William Cecil, that you cannot see; the Lord send you clear eyes that you once delight in the beauty of his temple."—"I do wish you well neither for your gold nor silver, nor for your great authority, because you can give me living; but because you have professed the Gospel, are a Magistrate in the Commonwealth where Christ is truly preached, and yet now do sustain much hatred of the enemy."—There is a good deal of honest sincerity in the letter, as well as of godly zeal, had it been but rightly directed, or better tempered.

\* They were also called *Precisians* by Archbishop Parker, who had a great deal of trouble with them. See his Life by Strype.

† It is certainly remarkable, that while the Puritans were inveighing against the Church government established by Elizabeth, and reproaching her for retaining the Romish hierarchy of Bishops, &c., Pope Pius's Bull anathematizes her for forsaking the Church of Rome, and admitting the *impious mysteries and institutions of Calvin*, to the overthrow of Bishops, &c. This mistake is rather remarkable, and we do not remember to have seen it noticed elsewhere as it deserves to be. The Bull had an eye also to the "evil Counsellors" of her Majesty, that is, her *Protestant* ministers, Bacon, *Cecil*, &c., whom it styles, in contradiction to the Catholic nobility, obscure men, as well as heretics.—The Bull may be seen in the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth, vol. i. 374. *Conæus*, speaking of the Earl of Arran's retirement from the French Court to Geneva, calls the latter, "*Omnium sordium commune receptaculum.*"



but the agitation of the subject set, it seems, the astrologers to work, who calculated the Queen's nativity, in order from thence to draw prognostics of what might be expected to ensue from such a marriage if it should take place. We cannot deny that this appeal to the vain science of astrology (*the folly of the age*, as Strype calls it), is strongly reported to have been set on foot by the Secretary, and absolutely to have been resorted to by that extraordinary man as a guide and direction to his own judgment.\* The calculation happens to be still extant, written by the Secretary, *propria manu*, beginning *De significatione 7<sup>mæ</sup> domus, et de conjugio*. The whole, indeed, may be seen in the Appendix to the second volume of Strype's Annals of the Reformation, No. iv.; one clause, as bearing upon the succession, is ridiculously curious. There was a hope to be drawn, it seems, of the birth of one son, that should be strong, famous, and happy in his mature age. "*Verum Venus est in domo propria, conjuncta Mercurio, domino filiorum. Et idcirco spes maxima datur de filio uno robusto, claro, et felici in ætate sua matura.*" The prognostics, however, of happiness, and a robust heir of her own body, were not sufficient to induce the Queen to venture herself within the indissoluble bonds of wedlock; one daughter also seems to have been promised, from the moon being in the constellation Taurus.— "*Luna in Tauro unam filiam designat.*"

In the month of September of this year, Sir William was commissioned by the Queen, in company with Sir Walter Mildmay, to hold a conference with her unfortunate prisoner, the Queen of Scots, then at Chatsworth, and to enter into negotiation with her upon certain articles, in order, if possible, "to satisfy and accord the differences" between them. Sir William is known to have expressed the concern it gave to both these eminent Ministers to be sent upon so unpleasant an errand, knowing, perhaps, that little good could come of it one way or the other;† it being impossible to devise such securities as should keep quiet the *friends* of Mary and *enemies* of Elizabeth. It is continually said

\* See the account of the Dutch astronomer, *Bomelius*, in the Life of *Parker*, ii. 1, 2, 3, 4. book iv. ch. i.

† There never certainly was a case, the details of which were so liable to perverse interpretations as this of Mary Queen of Scots. *Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio* would have the repugnance of Cecil to undertake this mission to be the greatest proof of her perfect innocence. "*Cecill, sous les yeux duquel s'étoit faite la procédure des conférences, d'York et de Westminster, qui avoit eu lettres de Marie, trembloit de paroître à ses yeux!*" with more to the same effect. We believe the disquietude of the two Ministers arose from very different causes, in fact, from the despair of doing any good.

that Elizabeth was always insincere in entering upon these treaties with Mary; that they never were encouraged by her but to gain time, or make a show of amity to satisfy the Ministers of foreign powers who were soliciting her enlargement. We cannot pretend to say that it was altogether otherwise; but we do not agree with the advocates of Mary in imputing this to a settled purpose of keeping the latter in custody, in mere resentment of her pretensions to the English crown, or to gratify the low passions of spite, envy, and malice, by a perpetual incarceration, in order to torment and persecute a fallen and *helpless* rival. We are certain that if Elizabeth could, with any prudence, have set her free, she would gladly have done it; she would herself have been relieved by it from many most tormenting cares and daily apprehensions; nor should it be forgotten that there was always a party in Scotland to whom she might have been delivered, but probably to undergo worse than she was suffering under the charge of Lord Shrewsbury.\* Again, if Elizabeth was insincere,† she had to practise upon two people the least likely in the world to be abused by her insincerity; Mary, who never cordially trusted her, though she professed to do so, and the Bishop of Ross, who knew both Queens too well to be deceived by either of them; who would have helped Mary if he could, but was very sensible that she put too much trust in the known *enemies* of Elizabeth, and who,

\* So little like a degraded Queen does she appear to have been treated at this time, that in the account written to the Queen of their first reception, the Commissioners describe Mary as being "in her Privy Chamber, under her cloth of estate," and with many attendants as it would appear, as in the next audience she is described as retiring into a private gallery, whence she secluded her company all but four. In a letter to "the Secretaries," in Howard's Collection, p. 376, from one of the English ministers at Paris, it is observed, "the Papists here, and the Scottish Bishops do praise the Earl of Shrewsbury to be a high friend of the Queen of Scots, for his well using her;" it is without date.

† It appears from a minute of the Secretary, still in existence, that *after Murray's* death, a resolution was taken at Hampton Court, "to return home the Queen of Scots." See Haynes, 579. What this exactly meant we do not pretend to say; the date is March 10, 1569, which, as it follows some letters written after Murray's assassination, we conclude to mean March 10, 1570, according to the present reckoning. One letter *preceding* this minute, evidently written three days only after Murray's death, and dated 26th of January, 1570, is from the celebrated Scotch Secretary Maitland, to Sir William Cecil, in which, though he had not joined the King's party, he writes, "You know of old what reverence I bear to your person, and how highly I do esteem your judgment, which maketh me to submit mine unto yours; so that I am rather to be directed by you, (if you find any aptness in me) than trouble you with any thing I can invent."

if they ever should serve her, it would be only to answer purposes, as he frequently told her, of their *own*.\*

Of the negotiation generally, an account may be seen in Haynes, p. 608, &c., where all the articles delivered by Sir William and Sir Walter Mildmay, with Mary's answers and requests, may be read at large, with a further account of the suspension of the treaty, in consequence of letters received from the King's Commissioners in Scotland. It is enough for the purposes of this history to know, that the unhappy Queen gave due credit to Elizabeth's two great Ministers for the feeling and respectful manner in which they conducted themselves towards her,† nor was she destitute of help at the time, as the Bishop of Ross appears to have been present at all the conferences.

Dr. Stuart says, "During their stay at Chatsworth, these statesmen were entirely satisfied with the behaviour of the Queen of Scots; the candour, sincerity, and moderation which she displayed, were full assurances to them that upon her part there was no occasion to apprehend any improper policy or art; and the calamities of her condition were a still securer pledge of her compliance." We have no wish to dispute a single word of this passage, but the great question was, could there be any certain security in Mary's compliance alone? Was not the Pope at hand to absolve her from all pledges, and Catholic armies ready to dissolve by force all securities, if they could once get her into their possession? We have copies besides of the accounts rendered to the Queen by Sir William Cecil and Sir Walter, of the conferences held with Mary, and written on the very days they took place. They are certainly very interesting and very affecting; but they do not evince that confidence altogether in Mary's sincerity that Dr. Stuart speaks of, at least as to things past. Thus, they expressed to her, in answer to her frequent declarations of intending Elizabeth no harm at any time, their suspicions that she knew of the rebellion in the north the last year. "We found her most troubled and amazed with that we charged

\* According to Dr. Stuart we must except Charles IX., who is said to have been attached to his accomplished sister-in-law; and who, early in 1570, had sent the celebrated M. Verac, of whom we have spoken, into Scotland, to procure her help.

† "We found the Bishop of Ross, in many things, by his words and advices to her, very ready both to move her to assent and to allow of her answers to our contentations; and, indeed, it seemeth that in these matters she dependeth much upon his opinion." And in the second letter they speak of her "being most directed by the Bishop of Ross." In some things they could not prevail at all to have the articles stand as they were. "We could not, by any persuasion, move either her or the Bishop to forbear the change in them."



her to have had intelligence with your Majesty's rebels; she would not deny that she understood divers things from them,\* but they never had comfort from her: and charging her that she dealt not well in concealing of things uttered to her, she said, when she used so earnest suit at Bolton to come to your presence, she *meant then* to have shewed your Majesty some things that she otherwise could not do." It does not quite appear why she could not have done it, through her Minister. In excuse of the Queen's not admitting her to her presence, instead of harsh reflections, she was only desired to "consider that Princes be like mountains that hardly can meet; such is the condition of great Princes, that they lack herein the commodity which private persons enjoy." Stronger reasons *might* certainly have been alleged, as they had been by others, but at this time they were better avoided. There is one very curious passage in the first letter: "She desired us to hear what she could say in her defence, and also what we could charge her with also that she might answer. Whereunto we told her that we had no meaning to charge her with any thing unless by her defence of herself she would occasion us so to do." There can be no doubt that they had much to charge her with, as tampering with the enemies of Elizabeth, charges she could not have satisfactorily answered; but it was so natural that she should have done so, however imprudent, that we cannot but admire the two Ministers for doing all they could to avoid being driven to a necessity of accusing her. The interviews and conferences, however, from the accounts preserved, must have been very distressing, as well when she was sorrowful as when she was more impassioned and vehement in her manner. The reports of the Commissioners to the Queen, from Chatsworth,† do them credit. There is nothing in them to make Mary's case worse with Elizabeth; much, on the contrary, to move her compassion, had it been possible so to work on a mind, hardened, as it would seem, by the *fatal* tendency of the competition between the *two* Sovereigns, never to be concealed, and therefore precluding the concessions looked for on the part of Elizabeth.

\* How much Mary was a party to this revolt, may be seen in the examination of Hamelyng, by Sir Francis Knollys and Sir William Cecil; *Haynes*, 594.—And yet see how earnestly the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland had admitted the truth of the allegations against Mary, and the propriety of Elizabeth's refusing to admit Mary to her presence.—*Goodall*, No. xcv.

† One of the letters to the Queen, dated on the *second* of *October*, 1570, concludes thus: "But in this we mean to prolong no time, for this morning, unlooked for, we have seen winter entered into these peakish mountains, having a large snow fallen round about us, so as if the weather follow as it hath begun, we shall wish ourselves away."

Mary's answers throughout the whole of the negotiation bespeak much shrewdness; nor can we forbear to notice the suggested alteration spoken of elsewhere, of substituting for "*any issue*" her Majesty might have the words "*any lawful issue*;"\* a correction the more remarkable, because in the original article (a manuscript copy of which, belonging to Sir Walter Mildmay, is now, by the kind indulgence of the Earl of Westmoreland, lying before us) Mary's children are spoken of quite as generally as Elizabeth's, "with provision for the Queen of Scots, that thereby she shall not be secluded from any righte or title that shee or *her children* may hereafter have if God shall not gyve to the Q. Maj<sup>ty</sup> anie yssue of her bodye to have contynuaunce." This makes the case a more pointed one, as against Elizabeth, and rather a bold correction to venture upon, considering who is supposed to have been aimed at besides the Queen. We cannot help subjoining the following *settlement* of the case:—

"In the first note" [i. e. Mary's proposed alteration] "to the second article, these words [*Leefull yssue*] to be changed into *issue by any lawfull husband*;" to which Mary acceded; and it may be observed, that the limitation proposed in the case of Elizabeth, was allowed to be added to the article, as it concerned the *Queen of Scots* [and her *lawful issue*]. But we have something more to say upon this head. In the Apethorpe MS., obligingly communicated to us by the Earl of Westmorland, we find that Elizabeth very well understood the purport of the alteration proposed;† for in a letter addressed by her to Sir William Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmay, at Chatsworth, we find this angry passage:—

"First, when in her [the Q. of Scots] answer to the second article, she requireth that this word 'Lawful' may be added to the word issue, although we might take ourself to be herein touched in honour, yet considering she may peradventure measure other folks dispositions by her own actions, which we trust in God shall be always far from us, we are content the rather to overpass in silence, what we have cause to think hereof; and, nevertheless, mean not to

\* *Leefull*.—Scotch.

† This is of importance, as many different opinions have been expressed upon the subject; some thinking the term *natural* quite harmless; some that it was adopted in the famous statute, out of prudery.—See *Hallam*, 160. We believe, in Doctors' Commons, the term *natural* and *legal child*, has often been used for the legitimate offspring. It is plain, however, as we have shewn in the text, that Elizabeth felt the exception to be an affront. We have endeavoured to shew that Leicester might have a design to answer by it, after the Queen's death, and when she could consequently contradict nothing that he might choose to assert.

yield to her request, but are pleased that, instead of the word ‘lawful issue,’ these words may ensue, ‘by any lawful husband;’ for that it falleth out sometimes that persons do match in marriage with those that before entangled by some former secret contract unknown to the party that they match withal; and because we think not convenient to allow by writing her title in succession to the crown of this realm, having not at any time for our part entered into the consideration who hath right thereunto, we have, in her answer to this article, this word ‘pretended.’”

We have always felt surprised that Mary, or her shrewd adviser Leslie, should have given this provocation to Elizabeth, at the very commencement of this negotiation; but it certainly has given us some insight into Elizabeth’s opinion of Mary’s character, if not as well of Mary’s suspicion of Elizabeth. We may notice also that the resentment of the latter, as expressed in the paragraph above, proceeded not merely from herself, but from the Court and Council surrounding her Majesty at the time, where it is probable that Mary, even without such provocations, had always greater personal enemies, than either of the celebrated Ministers sent to her in 1570.\* The Queen’s letter begins with stating that every thing had been laid before the Council, the members of which therefore were as much responsible for the reflections cast on Mary, as Elizabeth herself—at all events, in this instance, Mary must be allowed to have cast the first stone, since the limitation proposed had been omitted in her own case, and the words, besides a most ungracious insinuation, bore hard upon Elizabeth’s own legitimacy, which was not merely disputed, but openly denied by all Mary’s Catholic friends. It is not impossible, after all, but that the whole party, Mary, the Bishop of Ross, Cecil, and Mildmay, had very reasonable grounds to suspect that Leicester meant, in case of Elizabeth’s death, “to obtrude some natural son of his own upon the English, for the Queen’s natural issue;” as Camden remarks, upon the passing the statute in the year ensuing, where the term “natural issue” was strangely introduced, as we shall have occasion to shew, and by which, as it is observed in the *Secret Memoirs of the Earl of*

\* In Leicester’s letter to Sussex, to be seen in Burnet, and referred to above, he proposes that “Mary should renounce all such interest or title as she *claimeth*, &c. during the life of her Majesty and the *heirs of her body*,” and he even asserts, that she had “wholly and frankly” offered to do so. This letter therefore must have been written before he knew of her proposed limitation. The Bishop of Ross knew as much of Leicester, as either Sir William Cecil or Sir Walter Mildmay.



*Leicester*, the royal honour of his Sovereign was touched. It is known that he pretended, in order to put aside the matches proposed to her Majesty from abroad, that he had been privily contracted to her, of which *privy contract* he meant to avail himself in case of her *death*. The extraordinary circumstance is, that he should be able to have such terms inserted in an act of Parliament; but if we look to the work above referred to, we may be able to judge of the extent of his influence, and we are ashamed to add (upon such a subject), even in both Houses of Parliament, and among the Puritans. We grant that the book is the same in substance as *Leicester's Commonwealth*, and a most severe work, but admirably written; and, as it is supposed, not without Lord Burghley's *help*.\* It is certain, however, that he is reported, in the book itself, to have had as much in his keeping of Leicester's own hand-writing, as would have been sufficient to hang him, "if either he durst present the same to her Majesty, or her Majesty do justice when it should be presented." If Lord Burghley had only countenanced such a collection of *charges*, to ruin or remove a political rival, it might reflect much on his honour; but when it was known that he was *per force* made to act with such a person in the Council and in Parliament, it became almost a measure of justice to himself and family, to bring forward such real *facts* as might fix the responsibility of certain very objectionable transactions on the right person; and thus, in the case before us, both Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmay might see reason for the alteration proposed, and be willing to let it pass to the Council, where, in their absence, probably, Leicester had most weight, and where the Queen's attention might be drawn to the suspicions of all the party. Of the extraordinary influence of Leicester, even in the House of Lords, an indisputable proof may be drawn from the number of proxies constantly sent to him, as noticed by D'Ewes. He had, indeed, managed to render so many dependent upon him, and to cause so many to stand in awe of his resentment of any adverse practices, that whenever, by accident, he was out of favour with the Queen, she heard nothing but lamentations around her, among all the dependants of the Court.—*Secret Memoirs*, p. 58. edit. 1706. "Those who did not lament," says the memorialist, "afterwards paid sweetly for their mirth." But to proceed with the negotiation at Chatsworth.

To shew how great attention was paid to the several proposals made on both sides, we shall transcribe the reasoning of the Queen and Council upon one

\* That he was the *author* of the book, as some have asserted, we cannot believe, from certain passages in it entirely contrary to his known opinions.

alteration proposed by Mary, as it was communicated from the Court to Sir William and Sir Walter Mildmay.

The fifth article ran thus :—

“The Queen of Scots shall not directly or indirectly receive any intelligence by or from any subject of England, without the Queen’s Majesty’s allowance, or without knowledge to be given to the Queen of England, without delay.”\*

Mary proposed, that after the words, “any subject of England,” should be inserted, “to the prejudice or disturbance of the Queen Majesty’s person or estate.”

In the letter sent by the Queen to Chatsworth, in reply to Mary’s requests, the following judicious opinion occurs in the *Apethorpe* MS.

“Her addition to the Vth Article gives us great cause to suspect her well-meaning to us, and our estate, for that she leaveth thereby an interpretation to herself, whether the intelligence which she may receive by or from any of our subjects be to the prejudice or disturbance of our person or estate, which if it should be granted, might be a means to colour any subtle device that might be practised underhand to the trouble of us and our realm; and therefore her request herein in no wise to be allowed.”

If we consider this remark as bearing upon the transactions of the last year, during which Mary had personally acknowledged to Sir William Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmay, that she had had an understanding with the rebels, without communicating to Elizabeth any thing of their purposes, we cannot but admit that the Council came to a wise determination; and in fact, the proposed alteration was withdrawn.

In the Queen’s letter to *Cecil* and *Mildmay*, from which we have transcribed the above, are many other excellent observations on the alterations proposed by Mary (or we should rather perhaps say, the Bishop of Ross), and which might well serve to shew in how very few words an advantage might be taken over any unwary negotiators. Thus Mary could easily be brought to consent to the forfeitures proposed in case she should attempt any thing against the Queen’s right or title, or aid any person so doing, *the same being denounced to her*, and she *admonished to desist*; but they were for postponing all forfeitures till it should be ascertained that she had not desisted, according to such *denunciation and admonition*; which was as much as to give her leave to practise against the

\* Probably drawn up with a view to Mary’s suppression of her intercourse with the rebels during the last year.

Queen, till it should *happen to be found out*. The letter therefore thus expresseth the opinion of the Queen upon this proposed alteration.

“ Her addition to the third article of assurance for the observation of this treaty we find stronger than any of the rest ; for where she herein desireth it may be added, that *before* the advantage limited by the said article shall be taken or extended against her, she shall be *first* by our *denunciation* and *admonition* required to *desist* from the aiding or assisting of any person to deprive or dispossess us of any parcel of the kingdoms of England and Ireland, or the members thereof, and from the aiding of any notorious traitor or rebel of England or Ireland, being in either our dominions or without ; we cannot but think she hath herein some secret meaning, neither to be well thought of nor allowed. For she cannot *desist* from that which she shall not have *first enterprised*, and to leave her to that liberty that she may take in hand the assisting of any person or prosecuting any device to our prejudice, until she shall thereof be admonished from us, cannot but be dangerous to our estate, considering that the same may be *both begun*, and *peradventure brought to pass*, before we shall *get knowledge thereof*, and so will it be too late to give *warning* unto the said Queen to *desist* from it in time, and therefore we think that clause in no wise to be allowed.”

This alteration, therefore, was given up ; but there appears to have been some good reason for attending to it, since the Queen of Scots seems to have been allowed at *the very time* to communicate with the *Pope*, the *King of France*, and the *Duke of Alva*, who concurred in advising her to accept all the articles proposed to her, but at the same time promising to assist all her adherents with money, ammunition, and troops, if the treaty should miscarry ; as the Bishop of Ross had represented to them, that the articles were hard and humiliating, yet such as she must sign, without their speedy and effectual assistance and relief, it would look as if they only counselled her to accept the terms offered, to comply or not afterwards as she or they might choose.

Not many months after Sir William's mission to Chatsworth, her Majesty was pleased to advance him to the honours of the Peerage. Whether he was weary of the Court, where many things must have been continually passing, very unsuitable to his habits of life and ways of thinking, or not ; he seems to have taken little pride in his elevation, though, perhaps, no honour could have been more deservedly conferred, and none, perhaps, were ever more honourably bestowed. The Queen being particularly sparing of such high distinctions, and



having, indeed, in the course of twelve years, made only *four* Barons, *Cecil* being one.\* *Strype's* account of this circumstance in the life of the great Statesman, the subject of this Memoir, is very good, and deserves to be transcribed.

After speaking of Elizabeth's daily occupation of reading Greek, and "conversing with ancient authors of Philosophy and Divinity," he proceeds: "One of this learned Queen's wise Counsellors was Sir William CECIL, her Secretary of State, learned himself, and also a chief patron of learning and religion: whom this year she worthily advanced to the honour of a Baron of this kingdom, by the title of BARON of BURGHLEY,† the name of his noble house in Northamptonshire; and still giving title to his eldest son's issue, the Earls of Exeter; not advanced for his wealth, but for his worth; but he remained Secretary for some time after; though it was thought then (as the Earl of Leicester wrote to Walsingham) that ere long he should have the office of Privy-seal." If we will take his title from his own pen, thus he wrote to Nicholas White, his friend in Ireland: "My stile is *Lord of Burghley*,‡ if you mean to know it for your

\* Camden, and Rapin. "No man," says the latter, "had better deserved than he to receive this mark of distinction, which was very considerable in the reign of a Queen who conferred honours with great circumspection." Fuller says much the same: "At last after long service made Baron of Burghley; for the Queen honoured her honours, in conferring them sparingly."—*Holy State*, p. 256. Echard speaks of his being "created Lord Burghley, with commendations answerable to his extraordinary worth and superlative abilities." The following is taken from the Memoirs of the Court of Elizabeth: "Elizabeth soon after paid homage to merit in another form, by conferring on her invaluable servant CECIL,—whose wisdom, firmness, and vigilance had most contributed to preserve her unhurt amid the machinations of her most implacable enemies,—the dignity of Baron of Burghley; an elevation which might provoke the envy or resentment of some of the Courtiers his opponents, but which was hailed by the applauses of the people."—Vol. ii. p. 4.

† "As he thus continued his care in service, so he grew in favour of his Prince and liking of the people. And having twelve years served as Secretary, he was by her Majesty created Baron of Burghley, upon Shrove Sunday, the 25th of February, 1570, [13th Elizabeth,] continuing still Secretary."—*Life by a Domestic*.

The Letters-Patent set forth that he was to be ennobled "as well for his long services in the time of our progenitors Kings of England, as also for the faithful and acceptable duty and observance which he hath constantly performed from the beginning of our reign, and ceaseth not daily to perform many ways, not only in the great and weighty affairs of the Council, but generally also in all other concernments of the realm, and also for his circumspection, valour, wisdom, dexterity, integrity of life, providence, care, and faithfulness."—*Camden*, 154.

‡ In the P. S. of a letter to Walsingham, March 25, 1571, he writes, "My stile of my poor degree is Lord of Burleigh."—*Digges*, 72.

writing, and if you list to write, truly the poorest Lord in England. *Yours*, not changed in friendship, though in name, WILLIAM BURGHLEY." And about the same time he wrote to Walsingham in France, (March 1st, 1570), subscribing his letter, *Your assured, as I was wont*, WILLIAM CECIL, *and as I am now ordered to write*, WILLIAM BURGHLEY.\* And in his own Journal he wrote, "That he was created Baron on the 25th of February, being Shrove Sunday: yet called Lord Burghley some time before."†

Among those who particularly congratulated the new created Baron, the reader, perhaps, will be surprised to find the *Bishop of Ross*, the principal minister of Mary Queen of Scots; and who had so lately been with him at Chatsworth; his words are these: "When I was going to write your Lordship's accustomed style of honour, I was warned of your late honourable promotion, whereof I am *most heartily glad*. For your *virtue, wisdom, and experience* has merited that, and *much more*, and happy is that commonwealth where the magistrates are so selected; *et quum aut sapientes gubernant, aut gubernantes philosophantur*."‡

If the Secretary wrote, or seemed to write, carelessly about his new honours, of which many would have been more proud, we may probably attribute it to the very perplexed state of public affairs, which appear to have much harassed his mind. In a letter to the same friend in Ireland, of whom we have just made mention, after Strype, who indeed supplies us with many important particulars at this period of Lord Burghley's life, he writes as follows: "I cannot well resolve what to write, such are the varieties and changes of time, that may alter my advertisements between my writing and your receipt. Therefore I will write of things not subject to change by me while I live. I do continue, nor will desist, to love heartily the honest virtues which I am persuaded are settled and rooted in you; for which I love you, and so will, except *you* make the change. I am as you have known me (if not more) tormented with the blasts

\* One of his letters to Sir Francis Walsingham, April 14, 1571, ends thus,

"Your assured loving friend, *William Cecil.*

"I forgot my new word, *William Burleigh.*"

† At the time Sir William was called to the Upper House, it appears from Willis's *Notitia Parliamentaria* that he represented the two counties of Lincoln and Northampton; his eldest son, Mr. Thomas Cecil, being at the same time member for Stamford, and his younger son, Mr. Robert Cecil, also in Parliament.

‡ Ross was at this time in custody of the Bishop of London. See a curious account of him in Strype's *Grindal*, 222.

of the world: willing to live in calm places; but it pleaseth God otherwise to exercise me, in sort as I cannot shun the rages thereof: though his goodness preserveth me, as it were with the target of his providence, from the dangers that are gaping upon me. *Vita hominis est militia super terram.* I use no armour of proof against the dart and the pellet, but confidence in God by a clear conscience." "He was a man," continues Strype, "that affected meditation and retirement, but could not be spared from the public." For to repeat one expression more, dropped in the same letter, "God send me some intermission from business, to meditate privately upon his marvellous works, and to exercise my thankfulness for his mercies and benefits."

About the time that Lord Burghley was made a Peer, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton died, at the house of his patron Lord Leicester, not without suspicions of poison;\* his death was certainly sudden and unexpected; in Cecil's Diary he is said to have died *ex pleurisi et peripneumonia*; and the same account is given in a letter to Walsingham, wherein the Secretary observes, "He doth but lead the way to us, whereof I for my part have had sufficient schooling, by my present sickness;" which sickness indeed (being a fit of the gout) seems to have been very severe, from several letters in Digges's Compleat Ambassador, in one of which he writes to Walsingham, "If my sickness alone were considered, or my irksome business laid thereto perused, I cannot think but you would excuse my not writing with my own hand, or any long letter by my editing of the hand of another. You shall perceive by the Queen's Majesty's letters, what I have been enforced with some pain to indite by reason of my restless sickness and business." From the date of this letter it is probable he was labouring under this severe attack of gout, when he was made a Peer. But to return to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton. Lord Leicester, to whom his death has been imputed, says (in a letter to Walsingham) that "his lungs were perished." Strype describes him to have been a busy intriguing man; which indeed seems to have been his true character, not only while Minister in France, but elsewhere. Sir Francis Walsingham, however, an excellent judge, seems to have had a high opinion of his *talents*; "For counsel in peace, and for conduct in war," says he, in a letter to Leicester, "he hath not left of like sufficiency his successor

\* In the Preface to Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*, I find mention made of "The Legend of (Saint) St. Nicholas Throckmorton, Knt. Chief Butler of England, who died of poison, anno 1570. An historical poem, by his nephew Sir Nicholas Throckmorton."



that I know." He was for some time no good friend to the Secretary, though in his dispatches from France, published by Forbes, he incessantly professed himself to be so. Such are the uncertainties of courtly connexions.

From a letter, however, in Haynes, p. 571. addressed to the Secretary by Sir Nicholas just before his death, the latter appears to have wished to exonerate himself from some charges of ingratitude and insincerity towards the former; in fact, Throckmorton was Leicester's man, but it has been conjectured that a secret reconciliation had taken place between him and Cecil, which hastened the end of the former. We must copy what appears in the secret memoirs of Dudley Earl of Leicester, as a record of those times, though we cannot be expected to vouch for the truth of the fact.

"I was recounting to you (said the gentleman) others made away by my Lord of Leicester with like art; and the next in order, I think, was Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, who was a man whom my Lord of Leicester used a great while, as all the world knoweth, to overthwart and cross the doings of my Lord Treasurer, then Sir William CECIL, a man, specially always disliked of Leicester, who in respect of his old master, the Duke of Somerset, as also for that his great wisdom, zeal, and singular fidelity to the realm, was like to hinder much this man's designments; wherefore, understanding after a certain time, that these two Knights were secretly made friends, and that Sir N. Throckmorton was like to detect his doings (as he imagined), having conceived also a secret grudge and grief against him, for that he had written to her Majesty, at his being Ambassador in France, that he heard it reported at Duke Montmorency's table, that the Queen of England had a mind to marry her horse-keeper, invited the said Sir Nicholas to a supper, where, by a surfeit there taken, he died of a strange incurable vomit. But the day before his death, he affirmed plainly that he had taken poison in a sallat; inveighing most earnestly against the Earl's cruelty and bloody disposition, affirming him to be the wickedest, most perilous, and perfidious man under heaven." Camden says, "Sir Nicholas died in a good time for him and his, being in great danger of losing life and estate by reason of his restless spirit." His Letter, indeed, to Mary Queen of Scots, preserved by *Melvil* [Memoirs, p. 119], is sufficient to shew this.

On the removal of Bishop Grindal from London to the archiepiscopal see of York, which took place early in the year, Lord Burghley endeavoured to persuade his friend, Dr. Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, to accede to the Queen's nomination of him as the successor of Grindal; but the Bishop appeared very

backward to accept the proffered translation, so that Lord Burghley was obliged to remonstrate with him, and, probably, in such forcible terms, as to make the Bishop apprehensive that, by his backwardness, he had offended both the Queen and Lord Burghley himself. To the latter, therefore, he wrote a sort of penitential letter, to be seen in *Strype*, and in which he excuses himself from all intention of giving offence. "I have given no just cause of offence," says his Lordship: "my conscience standeth clear. I have ever honoured and loved you, before all other men; I have been, and will be very ready, at your commandment, in what I can." The worthy Bishop had already fallen under the displeasure of *Leicester*, in consequence of his having written privately to Lord Burghley before *him*.\*

The translation however took place, as the Secretary wished; and it would appear, from abundance of letters still preserved, that the friendship subsisting between Lord Burghley and the Bishop was in no manner impaired by what had passed, but that they continued upon the best terms to the end of their lives.

Having spoken of the bad state of Lord Burghley's health at the beginning of this year (or termination of the last, according to the reckoning of those times), the following passage, in a letter from that celebrated minister, Sir Francis Walsingham, ought not to be omitted:—

"I was right sorry to understand that the gout hath of late newly assailed, after so small a time of respite. Surely, Sir, seeing that both God and nature do so require, you must with importunacy desire her Majesty so to use your service, as you may long serve; of whose lack, I pray God, she may never have trial."

\* *Life of Parker*, ii. 9.—The Primate himself also, about this time, incurred the displeasure of Leicester, for not abetting the latter, according to the author of his *Life* (1727), in a case, where he probably had received a bribe. Upon this occasion the Archbishop, in a letter to Lord Burghley, wrote, in allusion, as it is judged, to Leicester, "*Sunt quidam, quos si quid juves, plumâ levior gratia; si quid offendas, plumbeas iras gerunt.*"

## CHAP. XII.

1571.

The Thirteenth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, began November 17, 1570.

*Dates puzzling—Marriage of the Queen revived—Walsingham sent—His instructions—Leicester and Burghley specially appointed to treat with the French minister—Sir Thomas Smith sent to Paris—Duplicity of both Courts—Scotch Commissioners—Leicester's account to Walsingham of the conference—Walsingham's answer—Of the part Cecil had to act in Mary's case—Duc d'Anjou—Ridolpho—Duke of Norfolk—Rapin's account of their plots—Intrigues against Elizabeth carried on by Mary with Spain and France—Bishop of Ross committed to custody—Lord Burghley's letters to Lord Shrewsbury—Spanish minister sent out of England—Design of the Spanish Faction against the Queen's and Lord Burghley's life—Parliament meets—Debate on the succession—Bill passed making certain offences treasonable—Sir Thomas Smith—Death of Bishop Jewel—His Apology—Sir Francis Knollys—The Lord Keeper's speech on the opening of Parliament—Of the great share Lord Burghley had in the good government of the kingdom—Affairs of the Church—Strype—Protestations—Leicester—Code of ecclesiastical and civil laws—Battle of Lepanto—Archbishop Parker—Lord Burghley's daughter married to Lord Oxford—Miss Aikin's character of Lord Oxford—Queen's Progresses—Theobalds.*

WE have already intimated that some of the transactions included in our account of the last year, belong rather to the one we are now entering upon, as having occurred in the first months of the year 1571, though, according to a computation then much in use, assigned by many historians to the year 1570. To keep strictly and invariably to the historical year, might subject us to the imputation of gross mistakes in points of such importance; for instance, as deaths, births, advancement to honours, &c. &c., which must be known to stand recorded in *other* places under dates apparently different. Thus, the very monument erected to the memory of the Regent Murray, of whose death we gave an account in our last chapter, states, that he was assassinated towards the close of the year 1569; but as it was on the 23d day of the month of January, the historical reckoning would more properly place it in the very commencement of the year 1570. The advancement of Sir William Cecil to the peerage, which we



have also noticed in our last chapter, having taken place in the month of February, has, in like manner, led many historians to put it among the events of the year 1570,\* though more properly speaking, and according to the course of modern computations, it happened in 1571, and in the thirteenth year of the Queen's reign.

We have also alluded in our last to the proposed marriage of the Queen with the French Prince the Duc d'Anjou, the negotiations concerning which began indeed in 1570, but were more earnestly carried on in the present year; to which purpose, Walsingham (a creature of Lord Burghley's, Rapin calls him, but that he was any otherwise so, than as a most able disciple of his great school of politics,† it would be difficult to shew,) was sent to Paris, with instructions from the English court, drawn up, as it is generally supposed, by Lord Burghley himself, which have obtained a reputation too marked and particular to be properly passed over; we allude to what we find said of them in the celebrated work of *Wiquefort* on the Functions of an Ambassador, in which that curious writer, speaking of Walsingham himself, not only calls him, "un des plus adroits esprits que l'Angleterre ait produits," but pronounces the letter of instructions given to him by Lord Burghley to have been, "une piece si bien tournée, qu'il

\* The confusion occasioned by these differences of computation we have often found to be very perplexing. Thus, the same writer sometimes uses both computations, as may be seen in *Digges' Compleat Ambassador*, where Sir Francis Walsingham will be found to date some of his letters in February, 1571, and some in March, 1570, though both months were in the same year. Leicester, in communicating to him the death of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, dates his letter February 14, 1571. Sir Francis dates his *Answer*, March 5, 1570.—*Digges*, 47, 48.

† "Two such ministers of state as no age in this nation has produced their equals."—Address to the Reader, by the Editor of *Digges' Compleat Ambassador*. "Cecil bred him his agent," says Lloyd, in his *State Worthies*, "as he bred hundreds. His apprehension was quick, and his judgment solid: his head was so strong that he could look into the depth of men and business, and dive into the whirlpools of state. Dexterous he was in finding a secret, close in keeping it; much he had got by study, more by travel, which enlarged and actuated his thoughts: his converse was insinuating and reserved: he saw every man, and none saw him." There is a very curious little book extant, called "*Arcana Aulica*, or Walsingham's Manual of Prudential Maxims for the Statesman and Courtier." How far in its present state it is altogether to be attributed to that eminent Minister we are not prepared to say, but it contains many curious rules or maxims, chiefly drawn from the classical writers. It was translated into French, and published at Lyons, 1695, under the following title, "*Maximes Politiques ou le Secret des Cours*;" upon which the authors of the *Dictionnaire Historique* make this remark: "Ce *Secret des Cours* n'en est plus un aujourd'hui; et son livre est du nombre de ceux que le tems a rendus inutiles."

ne se peut rien voir de plus fort ny de plus judicieux sur un sujet si difficile.”\* The subject, indeed, *was* a difficult one; for it was to persuade Charles IX. and Catherine de Medicis to be lenient towards the Hugonots; to plead in favour of the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, and the Admiral de Coligni, who were detested by that bigoted court; and, if possible, to induce the Duke d’Anjou to renounce Catholicism in order to marry Elizabeth, which latter the young Prince seemed to be extremely desirous of doing, if the high protestations he made to Walsingham himself upon the subject, are to be at all credited.

Upon this, as upon all other occasions of a similar nature, it appears to have been impossible to fathom the depths of the Queen’s own mind;† so much was to be apprehended from the Queen of Scots’ pretensions, as long as Elizabeth remained single, that there is little room to doubt that Lord Burghley sincerely desired that she should form some suitable match; and upon hints received from abroad that the Duc d’Anjou was by no means bigoted to the Romish faith, the alliance contemplated seemed to afford as good hopes as any. The marriage alone would make some of Mary’s adherents waver, and so close a connexion with France must have been likely to give strength to Elizabeth against others of the states of Europe, particularly Spain.‡ But it seems probable, that whatever advances were made on either side, neither Elizabeth nor the French court entertained any sincere desire of concluding such a marriage. It is said that Lord Burghley for some time really judged the Queen to be in earnest, and

\* Tom. i. 352. The instructions are to be found at the beginning of Digges’s Compleat Ambassador. They bear the signature of CECIL at the foot of them; but there is a still more important paper in the same work, p. 9, purporting to be a full statement of Elizabeth’s proceedings in regard to Mary Queen of Scots, and addressed to Sir Henry Norris by the Queen’s Majesty, for the information and satisfaction of the French Court. This paper should certainly be perused by all who would wish to judge properly of the real bearings of that disastrous case. It seems to have been entirely drawn up by Lord Burghley.—See p. 18.—See also the instructions to Walsingham immediately following, signed William Cecil, Dec. 22, 1570.

† “As for the inward intention of her Majesty in this case, we cannot certainly give you to understand more than it pleaseth her to utter.” Letter to Walsingham, July 8, 1571. Signed Ro. Leicester, Will. Burleigh.

‡ Lord Burghley looked further, and appears from one of his letters to Walsingham, to have contemplated the possibility in case the match should proceed, and the Duke renounce Catholicism, of his becoming, in conjunction with the German Protestant States, the head of a confederacy to root out Popery entirely.—*Strype’s Annals*, ii. Digges, 72. The Duke was thought to have imbibed some good notions of Protestantism from Carnvallet, one of his governors,

Walsingham was not less deceived by the flatteries and dissimulation of the French King and his mother.\* Elizabeth found some repose from other troubles while the negotiation was kept on foot, and the French Court probably sought to lull the Hugonot party to sleep, in order the more treacherously to take them by surprise, as happened soon after. In the mean while, the usual difficulty† gave scope to the intrigues of both crowns. Elizabeth was for a long time pertinacious in exacting conformity to the established religion of England, on the part of the young Duke, which the French Court took advantage of as tending to a rupture of the negotiation on the *side of England*, being careful not to oppose it so openly, or so much, as to incur itself the blame of breaking off the marriage; in fact, both parties, from the month of March to the month of September, acted with equal duplicity towards each other; but Elizabeth appears to have actually deceived the chiefest of her own Court and Council, *Burghley, Walsingham, ‡ and Leicester; §* so that her real intentions, with regard to

\* See some curious instances of this in Strype's Annals, ii. The Ambassador appears, by his correspondence with Leicester, to have fancied at one time, that even Charles IX. was becoming a convert. He speaks plainly of the King's revolt from Papistry, and adds, "Surely, I am of opinion, that if this match go forward, it will set the triple crown quite aside."—*Digges*, 83. We are not unwilling to record these instances of the English ministers being occasionally overreached, because it serves to prove the extreme subtlety and deceit with which they had constantly to contend, and ought to excuse that wary policy on their part which has been too often construed into a natural and constant disposition to artifice and intrigue. It should be recollected, that three-fourths at the least of civilized Europe were caballing *against England*. In Strype's Annals alone, to refer to no other authors, it may be seen under the very year of which we are treating, how busy the Spaniards and the Pope were, by every dark scheme they could devise, to frustrate what was supposed to be in hand between France and England.

† We call the point of religion the usual difficulty: it broke off the match with the Archduke Charles, and it broke off this; but in arguing the point, much was advanced of such curious plausibility, in favour of the conditions insisted upon by Elizabeth, that the annals of diplomacy can scarcely, perhaps, supply better papers, than the instructions given to Walsingham.—See, among others, those that occur in *Digges's Compleat Ambassador*, p. 97; that Lord Burghley was the author of them may very reasonably be concluded.

‡ When Walsingham thought every thing was settled, Elizabeth started a fresh demand of the restitution of Calais, upon which that able Minister judged the case to be rendered desperate. Sussex and Leicester, however, gave counsel, as he says, "to forbear that toy of Calais;" and so things proceeded a little further.—*Digges*, 104.

§ Burghley and Leicester were particularly appointed by Elizabeth to treat of the matter with the French ministers at London. Lord Burghley's concern that the match could not be accomplished is well expressed in the following abrupt passages in a letter to Walsingham: "I have



matrimony generally, continued as great a mystery as ever.\* The negotiation, however, so far from terminating in any breach of friendship, was followed by a treaty for a defensive league between the Courts, in adjusting which, Sir Thomas Smith was sent to assist Walsingham, (Killegrew being also there,) while, in this fresh negotiation, it is now generally known, that France was only carrying on a little further her insidious purposes of amusing the Hugonot party, and Elizabeth, on whom its chief reliance was placed; for it appears from the letters of both Lord Burghley and Lord Leicester, that they had looked to no friendly termination of matters, if the match should fail. The French Hugonots were under similar apprehensions. "If neither amity nor marriage might take place," Walsingham wrote, "the poor Protestants here do think then their case desperate, as they tell me with tears."—Amity, however, but a most deceitful one, did indeed ensue, and of which, soon after, the wretched Hugonots had to taste the bitter fruits. Lord Burghley seems to have suspected what might happen. In August, 1571, he writes to Walsingham, "I fear the offers of so great amity will diminish or divert the former intention of the marriage, without which the French amity shall serve to small purpose, but to make us ministers of their appetites, and those fulfilled, to cast us off. Surely, I could have wished that the extremity of the marriage had been seen, before these *baits* of *amity* had

done my utmost, and so have other Counsellors. The Lord Keeper has earnestly endeavoured it: the Earls of Sussex and Leicester have joined vigorously in it; and I know none directly against it [See however, as to *Lord Arundel*, *Lodge's Illustrations*, i. 188]; but God has determined to plague us. The hour is at hand; his will be done with mercy."—*Digges*, 115. Leicester seems to have concluded that Elizabeth's "heart was not inclined to marry at all;" and, perhaps, he knew the inclinations of her heart as well as any. He seems to have been very anxious, through Walsingham, to have procured a portrait of Monsieur, which could not be easily accomplished, but some description of his person was sent to him. See *Digges*, 29. Walsingham's account of the Queen's choice of the Lords Leicester and Burghley, as delivered in person to Catherine de Medicis, ought not, perhaps, to be omitted: "I did not omit to tell her (*Catherine de Medicis*) that her Majesty, for the more secret handling of the matter, had made choice of two only counsellors, unto whom she had communicated it; the one, the Earl of Leicester, whom she findeth well to allow of any marriage which her Majesty liketh, though otherwise wrongfully doubted, so specially of this which is now in treaty; the other, the LORD OF BURLEIGH, of whose fidelity her Majesty has had trial ever since she came to the crown."—*Digges*. Of Lord Burghley's own assurance of Leicester's sincerity in promoting this match, we have a good proof in his letter to Walsingham, (*Digges*, pp. 104, 105,) and yet perhaps he was deceived. See "*Secret Memoirs*," &c.

\* See what Mr. Turner has said upon this, in his recent history of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, vol. ii. ch. xxx. note 107. p. 290.

been thrown before us. I see those most liked by such, as I could not find to like of the marriage."

Among other persons who were deceived by this treaty, Lord Burghley's great and esteemed friend, Sir Thomas Smith, was one; of whom, when he first entered on his embassy,\* that Noble Lord had written, that he was one, he thought, of such dexterity in his actions, and of such dutiful good will towards England, that no advice or direction could be given to our prejudice.† When the treaty was concluded, and more confidence given to Charles IX. than that artful monarch deserved, Smith wrote to Lord Burghley, "That now it could not be said that her Majesty was altogether alone, having so good a defence of so noble, courageous, and so *faithful* a Prince of *his word*;" but herein, says the diligent historian‡ of his Life, our Ambassador was mistaken of his man, none being so *false* of his word, and treacherous as he; all covered over with most artificial dissimulation. "To all outward show," says Walsingham, in one of his letters to Lord Burghley, speaking of Charles IX., "every thing is done in that sincerity, as he that trusteth least may right easily thereby be deceived." And in another letter, "He," (Charles IX.) "joined his words and countenance so together, as great demonstration outwardly of inward good-will, could not but be seen." Worthy successor of Lewis XI. ! §

It would appear to those who should be able to go deeply into the history of these times, instead of skimming the surface to supply the idle and superficial reader with a romantic tale of female jealousies, that every movement of a political nature on the continent of Europe, was calculated to give a fatal direction to the conflicting interests of Elizabeth and Mary; and that, to adopt an expression used upon the occasion, it would have been as difficult to bring fire and water to coalesce without the destruction of the one or the other, as for

\* The French Minister, de Foix, sent over expressly to treat of this marriage, was anxious to have Lord Burghley himself dispatched to Paris, to settle the league; but his Lordship, mistrusting the consequences of the treaty, declined.—See *Digges*, 134.

† Strype's *Annals*, ii. 63. Sir Thomas's Instructions may be seen in *Digges*, signed Will. Burleigh, Feb. 13, 1571.

‡ Strype's *Life of Sir T. Smith*, 109. ch. xii. where may be seen some curious conversations which passed between this able diplomatist and the Queen Mother of France, relative to Elizabeth's marrying, particularly as a security against the Queen of Scots, whom Smith told Catherine he cared not if they had in France, so soon as ever his Queen should have a son by the Duke d'Anjou.

§ We may have to notice hereafter some remarks of Mr. Turner on Charles's repeated duplicity, published since the above was written.

those two Queens to be suffered to exist in mutual safety. While the marriage of Monsieur with the English Sovereign was in treaty, conferences were holden in London between certain Commissioners appointed by the several parties in Scotland, tending to the release or further detention of the unhappy Mary; and however fallacious and insincere such proceedings have been alleged to be, yet we are much disposed to think, the result was not always so predetermined against Mary, by *Elizabeth* at least, as has been pretended. Lord Leicester's account to Walsingham of these very conferences, seems to us to carry with it a great air of truth. Not, indeed, that we can attempt to deny that there were devices on foot to "win delay," for we have it under Lord Burghley's own hand; see Digges, 78. But we must refer again to Leicester's letter for an account of the difficulties of the case. (Digges, 51.) The following extract may deserve attention:

"My Lord Ambassador, since my last letter unto you, I have little new matter worth the writing, saving now we are much troubled with the Scottish causes, the Commissioners of both parties are now here; and to write unto you what the end will be certainly as yet, I cannot. We find both sides very stiff, and hitherto, those for the King's party, very resolute for the maintenance of his authority; her Majesty's scrupulosity touching his title and government, we partly know. The unworthiness of their Queen to rule she granteth; but the instances of their cause to depose her from her dignity, she can hardly yet be persuaded in, so yet she remaineth much perplexed; on the one side, she is loth to set her up, or to restore her to her state again; on the other side, she is as loth to defend that which she is not well persuaded to have justice in it. Between these, her counsel chiefly seek for these two things: that herself may be preserved in surety, and the true religion maintained assuredly; for as the state of the world standeth, and upon thorough examination of this cause, it appears, that both the ways be dangerous touching the Queen of Scots; for there is danger of delivering her to her government, so is there danger in retaining her in prison, her friends abroad beginning to speak proudly for her."

That Lord Burghley himself was really perplexed, as well as others, we may judge from his well-known letter to Sir Henry Norris, September 26, 1570. "I am thrown into amaze at this time, that I know not how to walk from dangers. Sir Walter Mildmay and I are sent to the Scottish Queen, as by the Queen's Majesty's letters you may see. God be our guide; for neither of us like the message."—*Cabala*, 179. It was impossible, considering what he must have known of the state of Europe at the moment (see his Memorial in Haynes,



before referred to), that he could expect any security to Elizabeth from the measures on foot. No man could know better than himself the invalidity of all agreements; the basis of which was to consist in *concessions* arising out of the mere circumstances of the times, and liable therefore to change, and be as soon revoked as agreed upon; but he had before absolutely expressed to Sir Henry Norris, what he and others thought of the great danger to Elizabeth, from the state of affairs in Scotland.

“Sir,—My leisure serveth me, as I was wont to have it; all my time at command of others, and none for myself, and little for my private friends. By the Q.’s Majesties letters, you may perceive the state of things here. God send her Majesty a good issue of this Scottish matter, whereunto the entry is easy, but the passage within doubtful, and I fear the end will be monstrous.

“By your letters of late time, it hath seemed that your opinion was, for the Q.’s Majesty to be delivered of the Scottish Queen; but sure few here amongst us conceive it feasible with surety.”—May 23, 1570.

The question, as it concerned the Secretary, seems constantly to have turned on the surety of Elizabeth; and we must confess, that upon a full view of the case, it appears to us, that there was scarcely any alternative left, but that of putting a restraint on Mary’s person. It was indeed a sad and melancholy alternative, in all points of view; but we may be allowed to ask, would the other alternative have been less formidable, with regard to those who had to decide upon it on the part of England? Cecil was fully satisfied of its being the full design of all Mary’s friends to work the overthrow of Elizabeth, and with her, of Protestantism, both in the north and south of the island; and not being able to devise any sufficient security against these calamities, if Mary were restored, how could he be expected to counsel her being set at liberty? Could she have been delivered up with safety, there was every reason on his part to wish it; her detention was constantly hazardous to England, and full of embarrassments; and so far from Cecil being actuated by any other feelings than those of loyalty, and a vigilant care of his own Sovereign, the very visit he had just paid to Chatsworth, with Sir Walter Mildmay, seems to have impressed him with a high opinion of her powers of fascination; or to use the words of Dr. Gilbert Stuart, one of her advocates, of her apparent “*candour, sincerity, and moderation* ;” qualities for which we are very little disposed ourselves to give her *unqualified* credit, though we could not expect her to exercise those virtues to any great extent, with regard to England, in her then situation, as the apparent victim of a most complicated and afflicting

state of politics; to which state of things, and to which alone, as the true efficient cause, we are inclined to attribute her long captivity, and her final destruction. The propositions made to her at Chatsworth, may all be seen in Haynes. So little, however, do any of the negotiators appear to have expected a satisfactory result, that while the English minister thought it to be his duty to put the King's party on their guard, Mary's minister, the Bishop of Ross, as we have before observed, gave notice to the Catholic powers of Europe, that it was necessary for them to step in and rescue Mary from such ignominious concessions and hard terms; but as their other engagements and difficulties at home hindered them at that time, they hesitated not, as we have shewn, to advise Mary to submit to *any* terms; that is, in reality, to *pretend* compliance, and wait for *better opportunities*: here then the *adversaries* of Elizabeth were also seeking to gain time, or to use Lord Burghley's own words, to "win delay."

The perplexities on all sides were certainly very great. Mary's detention, which certain writers represent to have been, from the beginning, a mere wanton and wilful suspension of her power and liberty, on the part of England, being full of hazard to Elizabeth; if not more so than her release, yet very little less. Let us then inquire if any new motives for her detention had arisen at this time from the movements abroad, or Mary's own plans. We have only to look to Walsingham's answer to the very letter we have been transcribing, to detect one such motive at the least.

"By your Lordship's of the 26th of March,\* I find that there is some entry made in the Scottish matters, and that you see them so full of difficulties, as whether on retaining or releasing, there should be more safety, you can hardly discern things well weighed as well at home as abroad.

"The common opinion of such as are of judgment here, and wish well unto her Majesty and our country is, that if the pretended match between her Majesty and Monsieur should not go forward, then nothing can be so dangerous as her delivery; for here they stand upon this point, that neither the King can be safe, nor the realm quiet, unless Monsieur be provided of some other harborage.

"The places likely to be attained, and fit for his calling, where they would place him, are *two*—England and *Scotland*. If England refuse, then is Scotland more ready to receive him. This well weighed, though your Lordship, with the rest of the commissioners, are both wise and of great experience, notwithstanding so full of danger is the cause, as no resolution can grow to you, that shall be

\* It is printed by mistake February, but Leicester's letter bears date March 26.

void of peril. I pray God, therefore, in this hard case, that that course may be taken wherein is least peril, and most safety for her Majesty."

This throws some new light upon the subject of the sad rivalry of these celebrated Queens. If Elizabeth it seems should reject Monsieur, and release Mary, the latter was likely to be laid hold upon to make that Prince *King of Scotland*, to the renewal of the French influence in that distracted country, and probably to the overthrow of Elizabeth and the Protestant Church in both kingdoms. That the French Court wanted "some other harborage for Monsieur," seems proved by events; for the reader should know, that this same Duc d'Anjou, afterwards Henry III., was the very Prince whom his mother and brother, in order to get rid of him, procured to be elected King of Poland, sorely against his own will, obliging him to leave the most polished Court of Europe, for one almost comparatively as unpolished and barbarous.

In the mean while, that Mary should greatly resent her detention, be fearful even for her life, and look to all practicable quarters for relief, cannot excite any surprise, though the steps she was induced to take may be very reasonably lamented; especially as, in endeavouring to escape from her present restraint, she was constantly in danger of being entrapped into other snares, and could not fail to render herself dependant on unprincipled and suspicious agents, the go-betweens of their superiors. While the match, of which we have already said so much, was in agitation, and Elizabeth seemed to be likely to strengthen herself by a French alliance, Mary was, unfortunately, induced to turn to *Spain*, and to listen to some overtures from the *Pope*, which, however clandestinely communicated, could not escape the detection of those who had to protect the person of Elizabeth; and who indeed, as it appears, could only have been saved by their extreme and unwearied vigilance.\* In what we have said of

\* Their vigilance has been evil spoken of, as too much connected with the employment of spies. In all cases of this nature, attention should be paid to the things discovered or detected, and wherever the result has been, to check the course of any concealed treachery, or bring to light any covert purposes of real danger and mischief to the state, or person of the Monarch, it should reasonably be concluded, that none but spies could have helped to defeat such designs and purposes, before they became ripe for execution. Countermines are, at the least, as fair as mines, and counterplots as plots. One of the greatest advocates of Mary does not hesitate to acknowledge, "that while Charles IX. was openly courting Elizabeth, and doing an injury to Mary, he was yet secretly the friend of the Scottish Princess."—(*Gilbert Stuart's History of Scotland*, ii. 58.) The same author, however, is continually declaiming against the insincerity of Elizabeth and her Ministers, as if the only deviations from honest dealing were on the side of



Mary's being under alarm for her life, we alluded to two letters from Randolph to the Regent Lennox and the Earl of Morton, to be seen in Strype [*Annals*, vol. ii. 116, 117]; and which being intercepted, and conveyed to the Queen of Scots, were judged by the latter to portend great mischief against her person. These letters, as well as one from the said agent or minister to the Lords Grange and Lethington, to endeavour to draw them over to the King's party, do certainly betray much rancour against Mary, as wholly unworthy of being restored to her throne, and tend to shew, as Strype observes, "the infamy the Scottish Queen then lay under." There is certainly something very remarkable in the unguarded manner in which Randolph alludes to the Scottish Queen's guilt. "She is not worthy to live," says he, "whose cause ye defend, having committed so horrible offence! *This you know yourselves ; this you have spoken yourselves ; this you have allowed yourselves. Yourselves wrote against her, fought against her,* and were the chiefest cause of her apprehension, and imprisonment, and dismissal of the Crown ; with somewhat more that we might say, if it were not to grieve you too much herein."—Surely Randolph would never have written so, had he not been quite persuaded that both Grange and Lethington judged the Queen to be guilty of the crimes laid to her charge. He was endeavouring to bring them over to the King's party; and they had pleaded *conscience, honour, and safety*, as obstacles to such a step. He reminds them, that in taking the part they had at the beginning taken *against their Queen*, their conscience must have been already sorely wounded, if they *judged her to be innocent*. Having so acted, as to manifest their full persuasion of her guilt, a right conscience should rather move them to abandon her cause.—There is something very terrible in the harsh terms applied to Mary; but, considering to whom they were addressed, and the object in view, it is scarcely possible to suppose that Mary's guilt was not a matter of public notoriety, and indeed quite undeniable by the two Lords to whom the letter was particularly directed. (See *Strype*, vol. ii. Appendix, book i. No. ix.) Maitland's intercepted letters might reasonably, as we have observed, give Mary, to whom they were actually carried, cause of alarm for the safety of her person. It is but fair, then, to

England; whereas, in all likelihood, to judge from what we ourselves have read of the history of these times, never was so much insincerity used against any country as against England. Thus rightly enough, in our estimation, did Lord Burghley conclude his memorial of the state of the realm, this very year, in the following terms:—"But England must trust to reputation, by power and stout government, for otherwise no bond of writing or wax will serve."—*Haynes*, 588.

give the contents of some letters from Mary herself, intercepted about the same time, which we shall do in Lord Burghley's own words, from a letter addressed by him to the Earl of Shrewsbury, March, 1571.

“ My Lord,—After my most hearty commendations, this day I received letters from my Lord of Hunsdon, whereby he doth advertise me of a boy that should shortly come hither, with letters to that Queen, and for the full knowledge thereof I send to your Lordship the clause of his letter concerning the same, whereupon your Lordship may the better regard the partie.

“ I have disclosed the contents of some of the ciphered letters which your Lordship lately sent to me, being hid under a stone. One was from that Queen to the Duke of Alva, wherein she maketh plain mention of the practice of Ridolphi, imputing the discovery thereof to the negligence of others, and not of herself. Another of the letters was to Grange and Lyddington, to confirm them to stand fast, and to expect money from the Duke of Alva, with the Lord Seaton. The third is not yet deciphered. The Lord Seaton is indeed, by stealth, come through England, and so passed into Scotland by the middle March, and is in the Castle of Edinburgh.

“ Your Lordship's, assuredly,

“ W. BURGHLEY.”

We do not feel ourselves under any obligation to go very largely into the history of these affairs, since they are exceedingly well represented by other writers, and particularly by Strype, in his *Annals*; who expressly says, “ I am the larger and more particular in this relation of matters concerning Mary, Queen of Scots, to shew what just apprehensions the English Court and nation had of imminent dangers by means of her: especially *Camden being sparing of shewing her faults, and representing her as fair as may be, publishing his history in the reign of her son.*” Of Camden's partialities, or rather, of his timid suppression of facts, and contempt of Buchanan, enough, perhaps, is known to all readers of history; but while we forgive him for not exaggerating Mary's failings, and throwing as thick a veil as possible over certain parts of her life and character, it is not fair, upon Elizabeth and her Ministers, to conceal from the public any of her intrigues. Little disposed to regard her efforts to regain her liberty as *faults* in themselves, we only wish to draw the attention of the reader to the particular *nature* of some of those efforts, in order to shew how nearly they touched the safety of Elizabeth's crown and person, and thereby

to do justice to her Ministers and servants. Ridolpho,\* an agent of the Pope, and of whom mention has already been made, appears to have been the confidential minister of the private negotiations on foot at this time. By him, Mary, apprehending, as we have said before, that if the match on foot with the Duc d'Anjou should take place, she might lose France, sent letters to the Pope and King of Spain, to inform them of the state of her affairs;† and, unfortunately for the Duke of Norfolk, endeavoured to draw him again into the project of procuring her deliverance, for the purpose of marrying her. The Duke was, in some instances, cautious, but to very little purpose; he became, unwarily, too far implicated, and by the interception of letters, and seizure of papers intended to have been destroyed, the government came into possession of what was proposed to the Duke, by way of encouragement, on the part of the Pope and King of Spain. We shall take Rapin's account, as very short, and yet circumstantial enough to give the reader a sufficient idea of the dangers the servants of Elizabeth had to guard against, and with which alone indeed we have to do, as the biographers of that great man, whose history we are writing.‡

“Ridolpho, who was the Pope's private agent (it should rather have been *secret* agent, for he passed for a merchant), did all he could to persuade the Duke of Norfolk to undertake the Queen of Scots' defence. He represented to him that there were in England abundance of malcontents, who would be overjoyed to see him at their head, and by that means that he might revenge the injuries he had received, and the long imprisonment he had endured. He put him in hopes of powerful succours from the Pope and the King of Spain. At

\* Ridolphi or Ridolfi, for his name is variously spelled by historians.

† Mary would have acted more wisely, had she waited the issue of this negotiation. Had Elizabeth married Monsieur or his brother, and had a child by him, Mary might have been allowed to go to France, as Sir Thomas Smith told the Queen-Mother (*Digges*, 195); for then the French Court would have been as careful of the English crown, or, at least, of the succession to it, as the English could be. By tampering with Spain, she was raising jealousies in France as well as England.

‡ Lord Burghley's own account may be seen in *Digges's Compleat Ambassador*, in a letter addressed to Sir Francis Walsingham, September 14, 17, 1571; but, as part of the letter is in cipher, we do not attempt to transcribe it. The same letter announces the fact of the Duke of Lennox's assassination in Scotland, September 4. See also another letter from his Lordship, on both these subjects, p. 138; and for a more full developement of the intrigues against Elizabeth and England, proved by many indisputable documents, and the frank confessions of persons actually concerned, the instructions to Killegrew; p. 147.



the same time the Bishop of Ross frequently told the Duke, by Parker, one of his confidants, that by the help of his friends, who were many in number, it would be easy for him to seize the Queen, become master of her person, and detain her in custody until he had married the Queen of Scots, and provided for the security of the Catholic religion."—This very short account is sufficient to mark the course of the intrigues carrying on against Elizabeth at this time, with the connivance of Mary, and in which she seems to have proceeded very indiscreetly, the danger of discovery being so great; which is, and always must be the case, where crowned heads are concerned, and so much is necessarily entrusted to persons much below them.\* Though the Duke of Norfolk appears to have endeavoured, at first, to evade the proposals made to him, yet he could not so entirely abstract himself from what was going forward, as to escape with impunity; he fell, indeed, a victim to this abortive intrigue, and the liberation of Mary became every hour more problematical, if indeed it were ever intended, as some are disposed to deny. For, upon a fresh demand for her release being made in the name of the French King, this correspondence with Spain, and all the designs and plans connected with it were shewn to that King's Ambassador, who was asked, what she might not be expected to do in France, and at liberty, who could devise and carry on such projects, while so straitly kept? This being reported to the King, and the facts confirmed through the accounts sent him from England by his Minister there, he is said to have exclaimed, "Ah, poor thing, she will never cease till she lose her head!—In faith, they will put her to death. I see it is her own fault and folly. I see no remedy for it. I meant to help her; but, if she will not be helped, *Je n'en puis mais.*"

The particular projects said to have been in agitation were, to procure the invasion of England by Spain and the Netherlands, for the purposes of Mary's deliverance, and the dethronement of Elizabeth. Her reception in France

\* Ridolpho's general commission from the Pope was to sow sedition in England; "and it is not strange," says Lodge, "that he should apply himself for this purpose to the Queen of Scots; or that she, under such desperate circumstances, should hearken to his overtures, for the recovery of her liberty, and her marriage with the Duke of Norfolk." All this may be very readily granted (though still her proceedings should have been restrained by the promises she had given); but, with regard to Elizabeth and her Ministers, the main object to look to was the safety of the former, as the head of a Government, against which all the Catholic Powers in Europe were combined, and who by one false step might have been soon made to take Mary's place; or worse, if worse could be conceived. We have not the smallest doubt, indeed, in our own minds, that Elizabeth's fall would have been much more rapid, and much more ignominious.

being doubtful, if the match between Monsieur and the Queen of England should take place,\* her design was to proceed to Spain, and be betrothed to Don John of Austria, though she had already apprised the Duke of Norfolk, contrary to her solemn promises to Elizabeth of not renewing that connexion (see *Digges*, 148); that, if *he* consented to aid her designs, her match with Don John would be only *pretence*;† and that she should reserve herself for *him*, as soon as she should obtain possession of her son, for which she was practising with the Duke of Alva; the Prince also was to be transported into Spain, and married to the King of Spain's daughter.‡ In some of the papers intercepted, it was also found that she had spoken very injuriously of the Queen Mother of France.

Though all these projects and designs were discovered, it does not appear that any very rigorous steps were taken with Mary personally, in consequence of the discovery.§ It was quite expedient that some greater restraint should be

\* Mary's relatives in France seem to have been very suspicious of the negotiations on foot with England. "The House of *Guise* secretly doth travel by all means to break the amity with *England*, for that they think nothing will more prejudice the Q. of Scots, their kinswoman, than the same."—*Walsingham to the Lord of Burghley*, September 16, 1571.

† This appears to have been communicated to the Duke before the Commissioners met in London.—See *Strype's Annals*, ii. 119.

‡ See Lord Burghley's letter, *Digges*, 139. See also Sir Thomas Smith's letter to Lord Burghley, *ib.* 193—198; and the Queen's instructions to the Earl of Lincoln, May 25, 1572, signed Burleigh, p. 206.

§ See Lord B.'s letters to Lord Shrewsbury upon it, in Haynes, Strype, Lodge, &c. One of these letters must be transcribed :—

"Lord Burghley to the Earl of Shrewsbury.

"This matter of the Duke of Norfolk groweth daily larger upon examination; I am sorry to see so many touched therewith. My Lord Cobham is in my house as a prisoner, who otherwise should have been in the Tower: I loved him well, and therefore am sorry for his offence. The conveyance of that Queen from you, appeareth to have been many ways attempted, whereof the Duke confesseth to have been acquainted with sundry; beside Sir Thos. Stanley's enterprise, Sir Henry Percy, for whom I am right sorry, was a great devisor to have had her from you about Easter last, and the Bishop of Ross had before taken the measure of a window, where she should have been letten down. Your change of her lodging altered the enterprise, whereat she was much offended. Powell also your pensioner, who is this day sent to the Tower, was another enterpriser. One Raw, a servant of the Lord Lumley's, would also have stolen and carried her to a castle in Cleveland of the Lord Lumley's, but in all their confessions it appeareth your strait keeping of her disappointed them; of all these the offenders confess that the Queen was always privy."—19 Oct. 1571.

put upon her conferences and communications with the Queen's subjects ; but she was otherwise entertained honourably and well treated, as Lord Burghley, or rather the Queen in her instructions to the Earl of Lincoln, desired should be duly represented to the French King.\* Nor was she yet degraded below her rank as Queen of Scots ; for the punishment to be awarded to the Bishop of Ross, for his practising in the business, drew these points into question. As he claimed the privileges of an Ambassador, difficulties arose, which it was deemed expedient to refer to the Judges of the land, (or leading *Civilians*, as they seem rather to have been.) From this very reference, it appears, that Elizabeth had not yet attempted to deny Mary's title of Queen,† or openly acknowledged her to be a prisoner ; she had not been brought to allow that she was lawfully deposed, or incapable of appointing an Ambassador ;‡ but the

\* *Digges*, 139, in Lodge's *Illustrations of History*, vol. ii. 52, may be seen a curious *Chekeroll* (as it is there called) of Queen Mary's attendants this year, it is dated May 3, 1571, and consists, servants and all, of *thirty* persons, with *nine* others, stated to be "permitted of my Lord's benevolence," that is, Lord Shrewsbury, by whom the original paper is indorsed. It was however approved by Elizabeth, as Lord Burghley intimated to Lord Shrewsbury. "The Q.'s Majesty lyketh well of all your orders, and can be content that (if yourself be so content) the number *above* 30 permitted to be with that Queen by your Lordship shall remain."—*Lodge*, ii. 55. Elizabeth indeed upon discovery of these extensive intrigues against her, the drift of which could not be misunderstood, formed a more determined resolution to support the young King of Scots and his party, as may be seen in *Strype's Annals*, ii. 112.

† In the instructions to Sir Thomas Smith, Ambassador at Paris, these words occur—"And if they will needs have mention made of Scotland, we can be content that the same shall be (if we will not accept the name of the *King*) by the name *Regnum Scotiæ*, or *Regnum et status Scotiæ*."—*Digges*, 159.

‡ In a letter from Lord Burghley to Lord Shrewsbury, May 14, 1571, in which he is directed to make inquiries tending to impeach the veracity of the Bishop, who was at the bottom of all the intrigues going forward, is the following passage : "If the Q. of Scots be offended with the restraint of the Bishop, certainly you may say that the whole Counsell have found his practises against the Q.'s Majesty so evident, and, for the more part, now confessed by himself, that they all have fully and earnestly determined to proceed against him sharply, and that it is not the particular displeasure of any towards that Queen, or towards him." Of the amount of the Bishop's confessions, and of the conspiracy in general, a very good account is to be seen in the same letter.—*Lodge*, ii. No. lvi. The confessions obtained from several, by the use of the *rack* upon this and other occasions, it is impossible to defend, or in these days even think of without horror ; but such were the times, and we can only congratulate ourselves that we live in a more advanced state of civilization. It may however be asked, how long is it since Europe can be said to have been rid of this horrible expedient? It was no longer ago than 1816, that, to the praise of good



Bishop of Ross's interference led to another question, namely, how far even a regular Ambassador might forfeit his claim to privilege, by treasonable practices; and upon such grounds it was that this meddling Bishop was committed to custody.\* It was time indeed to settle this question, for it was too much the practice both with the French and Spanish Ambassadors, to lend themselves to the furtherance of purposes extremely inimical to the Queen's safety and repose, of which many instances are to be found in the history of these times; some leading to positive and deliberate expulsion, as happened indeed in this very case, with the Spanish Minister,† who was sent out of the kingdom for his practices with the Duke of Alva to invade England, and for his general knowledge and furtherance of the intrigues on foot.

As it is certain that Queen Mary had many friends in England, for she had a great hold upon the Catholics, and upon all who were dissatisfied with the Queen's Government, so is it very reasonable to conclude that she had many enemies, or, at the least, many persons opposed to her claims upon the crown,

Pius VII. (for such many of our countrymen now living would surely acknowledge him to have been) *torture* was formally abolished in all the tribunals of the holy office!

\* On the 5th of June, 1571, Lord Burghley, writing to Sir Francis Walsingham in France, says, "The Bishop of Ross is still restrained and so deserveth."—And see, as to the charges against him, Digges's *Compleat Ambassador*, p. 107. He was, however, afterwards released, through the influence of Lord Burghley himself, whom Strype calls "The mild Lord Treasurer."

† "This Ambassador," says Strype, "according as some letters of the Lord Burghley relate, had used himself crookedly, perniciously, and maliciously against the State, and the chiefest of the Queen's Counsellors, and openly against that Lord." And indeed, about the month of December, Lord Burghley appears to have been in great danger of his life by some of the Spanish faction, who had procured an Englishman to kill him, and the Queen too. The Spanish Minister had openly accused him at the Council-board, of being the cause of all the differences between Philip and Elizabeth; but Lord Burghley very properly appealed to the board, who unanimously affirmed, that he had done nothing but what had proceeded from her Majesty in Council. The Earl of Sussex in particular defended his friend, in a speech addressed to the Minister, in the Italian language: it was soon after this that the Ambassador was dismissed.—See Lord Burghley's letter to Walsingham, *Digges*, 161, 2. And in another letter he writes, "On Friday last the Spanish Ambassador was sent for to the Councell, and in the Queen's name commanded to depart the realm. The same hath been oftentimes intended, but never put in execution before this present, and now provoked by intelligence of certain new practices within this realm, to persuade the Queen's subjects that the King his master would aid them with power this spring."—December, 1571. In regard to the Bishop of Ross's case, Lord Burghley, in a letter to Lord Shrewsbury already cited, writes, "It is agreed by the learned Counsell, both civil and temporal, that the Q. Majesty may proceed against him as against a subject, for treason and conspiracy."

whether immediate or remote; immediate, as seeking to dispossess Queen Elizabeth, or remote, as claiming to be her acknowledged successor. Both these claims must have been extremely obnoxious to the Protestants,\* as well as to all those who were jealous of foreign influence. Mary was not only a Catholic, but of a Catholic family notoriously bigoted, and adverse in every possible way, to what was called, the spread of the gospel. All her dependencies were foreign, and now that she was a prisoner, it was manifest, that she was seeking deliverance by the hands of foreigners, hostile to England, to the present settlement of the crown, and to Protestantism.

It was in allusion to the divisions prevalent at this time, that the following passage occurs in Strype: "Queen Elizabeth would sometimes in the midst of her cares, divert herself by study and reading; and sometimes versifying, as she did in composing a copy of verses upon the Queen of Scots, and those of her friends here in England near this time: which Dr. *Wylson* has preserved to us in his *English Logic*; for she, to declare that she was nothing ignorant of those secret practices among her people, and many of her Nobility inclining too far to the Scottish Queen's party, though she had long with great wisdom and patience dissembled it, wrote this ditty most sweet and sententious; not hiding from all such aspiring minds the danger of their ambition and disloyalty, which afterwards fell out most truly, by the exemplary chastisement of sundry persons, who, in favour of the Scottish Queen, declining from her Majesty, sought to interrupt the quiet of the realm, by many evil and undutiful practices; her verses were as follow:

" That doubt of future foes exiles my present joy;  
And wit me warns to shun such snares as threaten mine annoy.  
For falsehood now doth flow, and subjects faith doth ebb;  
Which would not be if reason rul'd, or wisdom weav'd the web.  
But clouds of toys untry'd do cloak aspiring minds,  
Which turn to rain of late repent, by course of changed winds.  
The top of hope suppos'd, the root of ruth will be,  
And fruitless all their graffed guiles, as shortly ye shall see.  
Those dazzled eyes with pride, which great ambition blinds,  
Shall be unseal'd by worthy wights, whose foresight falsehood finds.  
The daughter of debate, that eke discord doth sow,  
Shall reap no gain, where former rule hath taught still peace to grow.

\* See however an exception in Strype's Annals, ii. 127-8.

No foreign banish'd wight shall anchor in our port;  
Our realm it brooks no stranger's force: let them elsewhere resort,  
Our rusty sword with rest, shall first the edge employ,  
To poll their tops that seek such change, and [thereto] gape with joy."

Though Strype's taste led him to call it "sweet and sententious," Miss Aikin is more right, perhaps, in her remark, that its *authenticity*, which has never been called in question, constitutes its principal merit. Puttenham has also inserted it in his "Arte of English Poesie."

On the 2d of April, 1571, 13th of Elizabeth, her Majesty's third Parliament met, which sat about two months, and one of the first subjects that fell under debate, happened to be about the succession. The entertainment of the suit of Monsieur, might, probably, be much connected with this discussion in Parliament, as Elizabeth, generally, upon such occasions, held out hopes of marriage. For as long as there was no marriage concluded upon, or prospect of lawful issue, it could not fail to become a great national question, who should, or who might, come next? Henry VIII. had marked out the line of succession, under a Parliamentary sanction, and Elizabeth reigned upon the footing of the same title; it was alleged by some, therefore, that those who had already sworn and paid obedience to the persons named in Henry's will immediately to succeed him, were equally bound to acknowledge those who came after them in the same line of succession, namely, the Suffolk family; but some were for going farther, and in fact, for totally setting aside the Scottish claims, as not acknowledged by the common law. Mary being indisputably, if that law could affect the inheritance to the crown, an *alien* born, though of the lineage of Henry VII., and as such not inheritable, in right of her father, mother, or grandmother; an elaborate speech to this effect is preserved among the Cottonian MSS., and may be read, as printed by Strype, in the Appendix to the 2d vol. of his Annals, No. viii.

At such times, and while, on other accounts, Mary's title became so questionable, her eagerness to throw herself into the arms of Spain, a connexion from which the nation had suffered so much in the last reign, could not fail to be exceedingly objectionable, and to excite a stronger disposition in many minds to uphold the government already established; strong resolutions therefore were passed, and strong measures resorted to, to protect the existing state of things, defend Elizabeth's title, secure her person, and resent all hostile attempts.



On the 28th of April, a bill accordingly was sent up by the Commons to the Lords, whereby certain offences there named, were made treason. It passed that House on the 8th of May, with a new proviso, and certain amendments added to it. This act, says Camden, was occasioned by the iniquity of the times, and the love which the Parliament then bore to their Prince and country. The following is the tenor of it :

“ That if any person should attempt the death or personal hurt of the Queen ; or raise war, or excite others to war against her ; if any one should give out that she is not the lawful Queen of this realm, but that any other can claim a juster title thereto ; or should pronounce her to be an heretic, schismatic, or infidel ; or should usurp the right and title of the kingdom during her life ; or should affirm that any other has a right to the crown : or that the laws and statutes cannot limit and determine the right of the crown and the successor thereof, every such person shall be guilty of high treason. That if any one, during the Queen’s life, should by any book, written or printed, expressly maintain, that any person is, or ought to be, the Queen’s heir and successor, except the natural issue of her body, or should publish, print, or disperse any books or writings to that effect, he and his abettors for the first offence, should be imprisoned for a whole year, and forfeit the half of his goods ; and for the second offence incur the penalty of a premunire.”

It is impossible not to discern in every clause of this act, a direct precaution against the designs and pretences of Mary and her friends, though at the same time the advocates of the Suffolk claims, were, at the least, equally laid under restraint. It was by some, opposed on captious, if not rather fantastical grounds,\*

\* Sir Francis Knollys, a known Puritan, judged it to bear hard upon the Queen’s Popish subjects, who must either pronounce her to be a heretic, according to the principles of their Church, or take the name to themselves, which they could hardly bear ; and he was for adding to the words of slander, the term Papist, as *some* judged her Majesty to be of another religion, than that published. Such expressions are intelligible enough considering who delivered them ; as to Camden’s notice of the term natural, he confesses that being a young man at the time, he remembers, that it was said to have been probably introduced into the act by Lord *Leicester* ; we need not point out the drift of this remark.—Though, indeed, Camden’s expression has some ambiguity in it ; his words are, “ Insomuch as I myself being then a young man, have heard some oftentimes say, that that word was inserted in the act of purpose by Leicester, that he might one day obtrude upon the English *some* bastard son of his for the Queen’s natural issue.”—167. See what has been said upon this under the preceding year ; we shall not repeat Whitaker’s outrageous remarks upon it ; though as far as Leicester was concerned, we cannot wish to screen him from the imputation of any mischievous designs.

and Camden himself sports with the term natural as applied to the Queen's issue, but it is impossible to deny that the act proves the great interest taken by the Parliament, in the security of her Majesty's person and government, and the deep sense it entertained of the dangers to be apprehended from Mary's expectations, and the intrigues of her adherents.

On many accounts, indeed, the nation had great cause strenuously to support Elizabeth ; maintain her rights, and pray for the continuance of her life ;\* some passages in the Lord Keeper's speech, at the opening of the Parliament, contain appeals to the people through their representatives, on the happy course of her government hitherto, exceedingly striking, and which, if not borne out by facts, could have been no better than a mockery of the Queen, who was present when he spoke.

"And here—albeit that the benefits that the realm hath received by God's grace, and the Queen's Majesty's goodness, both for the number and greatness, are such as may be more easily marvelled at, than worthily weighed and considered ; yet mean I to remember briefly *three* of them, whereof the first and chief is restoring and setting at liberty God's holy word amongst us ; the greatest and most precious treasure that can be in this world ; for that either doth or should benefit us in the greatest degree ; to wit, our minds and souls ; and look how much our souls excel our bodies, so much must needs the benefits of our souls excel the benefits of our bodies ; whereby also, as by a necessary consequent, we are delivered and made free from the bondage of the Roman tyranny ; therefore this is to be thought of as the most principal benefit. †

\* Considering what great changes might have ensued, to the utter loss and confusion of all true friends of the Reformation, at this time, had Elizabeth died issueless, the following strong expressions of that wise statesman, Sir Thomas Smith, are not hyperbolical. Lord Burghley having written to him that the Queen had been ill, but was recovering, though his care about her had not ceased, Sir Thomas answered him in the name of his colleague, Sir F. Walsingham, as well as his own, "that he might be sure it did as little cease in them, calling to their remembrance and laying before their eyes, the trouble, the uncertainty, the disorder, the peril, and danger, which had been like to follow, if at that time God had taken from them the Stay of the Commonwealth, and hope of their repose ; that lanthorn of their light, next to God ; whom to follow, nor certainly where to light another candle, they knew not."

† As in the course of this year, [viz. Sept. 23.] one of the greatest lights of the English Reformed Church, departed this life, we mean Bishop Jewel ; at which time also, a second edition of his celebrated Apology was put forth, we cannot avoid copying a passage, to be found in the dedication to the Queen, which admirably sets forth the true character of the Reformation

“The second is, the inestimable benefit of peace during the time of ten whole years together and more ; and what is peace ? Is it not the richest and most wished-for ornament that pertains to any public weal ? Is not peace the mark and end that all good governments direct their actions unto ? Nay, is there any benefit, be it never so great, that a man may take the whole commodity of, without the benefit of peace ? Is there any so little commodity, but through peace a man may have the full fruition of it ? By this we generally and joyfully possess all ; and without this, generally and joyfully we possess nothing. A man that would sufficiently consider all the commodities of peace, ought to call to remembrance all the miseries of war ! For in reason it seems as great a benefit to be delivered of the one, as to be in possession of the other. Yet if that were nothing, the common and lamentable calamities and miseries of our neighbours round about us, for want of peace, may give us to understand what blessedness we are in that possess it.—Now is it possible, trow you, that this blessed benefit of peace would have been from time to time thus long conserved and conferred upon us, had not the mind, affection and love that our Sovereign bears towards us her subjects, bred such care over us in her breast, as for the well bringing of this to pass, she hath forborne no care of mind, no travel of body, nor expence of her treasure, nor sale of her lands ; no advancing of her credit at home or abroad ? A plain and manifest argument, how dear and precious the safety and quiet of us her subjects be to her Majesty.

“The third is, the great benefit of clemency and mercy, I pray you, hath it been seen or read, that any prince of this realm, during whole ten years’ reign, and more, hath had his hands so clean of blood ? If no offence were, her

as being no separation from the pure Apostolical Church of Christ (as the Romanists pretended) ; a point always deserving of attention. After declaring that the only purpose of the Reformers had been, to remove errors, superstitions, and abuses, the dedication proceeds, “which lawful Reformation of our Church, and necessary repurgation of such enormities, is so far from taking from us the name or nature of true Catholics and Christians, or depriving us of the communion and fellowship of the Apostolic Church, or from overthrowing, endangering, or any whit impairing the right faith, religion, sacraments, priesthood, and government of the Catholic Church, that it has cleared and better settled them unto us ; and made us a readier and surer way to the true knowledge, right use, and happy fruit of them.” This edition was put forth in the name of all the Bishops, as Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, wrote to *Wolphius*, in Switzerland, “Is [Juellus] omnium nostrorum nomine edidit.” *Wolphius* indeed so highly approved the work, as to be at the pains to translate it into the German language. The account of the death of this worthy prelate and great ornament of the Church may be seen in Strype’s Annals, ii. 146—150.



Majesty's wisdom in governing was the more to be wondered at ; and if offence were, then her Majesty's clemency and mercy the more to be commended ; besides, like as it has pleased God ten years and more, by the ministry of our good Sovereign, to bless this realm with those two inestimable benefits of peace and clemency, so there is no cause, but the same might by God's grace have continued twenty years longer, without intermission, had not the raging Romanist rebels entertained the matter ; and here it is to be noted, that this merciful and peaceful reign of ten years and more, hath happened in the time of Christ's religion now established. I cannot think that any man can follow me in this, in the time of the Romish religion since the Conquest. These be the true fruits of true religion. I could further remember you of the fruits of justice, the benefit of restoring your money to fineness, &c."\*

We shall proceed no further, except it be to notice two other instances of good government, to be found in the Speaker's address to her Majesty, who commended her for having given free course to her laws, not sending or requiring the stay of justice by her letters or privy-seals, as heretofore sometime hath been by her progenitors used, and for not having pardoned any transgressors of the laws, without the advice of such, before whom the offenders had been arraigned, and the cause heard.

These are certainly remarkable testimonies to the course of Elizabeth's government during the *first ten* years of her reign, which have always indeed been distinguished from the succeeding years, by this particular circumstance ; that is, until the *quietness* of her reign excited the *jealousy* of Rome ; the English Catholics were too submissive to Elizabeth's Protestant government to please the Pope. Disturbance and agitation became necessary to answer his purposes, and from this period, by the violence of his Bull levelled immediately at the Queen, and

\* Owing to the particular care and attention of Lord Burghley, who was a great enemy to the depreciation of the currency, so sadly resorted to in some former reigns. To the same great and prudent Minister may probably be referred, the Queen's particular care to have all loans collected under the privy-seal, punctually repaid, a proclamation to that effect having been issued this very year, assuring all her good subjects, who had so advanced money in time of need, that upon proper proof delivered in of their demands, and shewn to the *Lord Keeper*, they should have order immediately to receive the whole sum due, at Westminster, without paying any manner of reward to any officer or person for the payment, or any manner colour for expedition therein ; and they might receive it by power of attorney, if inconvenient to attend personally, the Queen's intent being that her loving subjects should be *thankfully* and *freely* paid.

the seditious practices of his emissaries, to excite divisions among the Protestants, in order to make the Queen weary of the changes she had sanctioned, the blessings of peace, clemency and mercy, began to be greatly abated ; no alternative seeming to be left to the government, but to be prepared for war, guarded against traitors, and more rigid in exacting obedience from all the Queen's subjects.

There is no circumstance of praise however in the above speeches, which may not be said to redound to the credit of Lord Burghley ; a firm friend to the Reformation, an enemy to war if it could possibly be warded off or turned aside, a lover of justice, and of a disposition naturally mild and benign, it is impossible not to discern, that in acknowledging, as fruits of the Queen's government, the three great benefits of a Protestant Church, a ten years' peace, and for the same period a merciful and just reign ; her most private and confidential Minister must have been, though in some respects a subordinate, yet a most marked and leading object of all such commendations.

We are not forgetful however of the suspicions likely to arise in the minds of those who are accustomed to contemplate the fall of the unhappy Queen of Scots, as a demonstrative proof of the vindictive character of Elizabeth's government, and to regard that great Queen herself, as so far from being a clement and merciful Princess, as to be on the contrary a most remorseless and cruel enemy to the Scottish Queen, and highly intolerant as head of the Church. We will venture to say the truth of history does not warrant such very heavy charges, if all things be taken into account that should have weight in the decision of such points, and allowances be made for certain principles, not fully brought under regulation till a century afterwards ; we allude to the extravagant notions concerning the prerogative of the crown, arbitrary jurisdictions, and religious intolerance. But as we shall have more to say under the next year, upon the subject, when the Parliament took up the case of the Queen of Scots, and an act of vengeance against the Protestants abroad, seemed to mark the character of the Romish religion, as bearing no comparison for mercy and clemency, with what the Lord Keeper justly called the True Religion, we shall reserve all further remarks upon these subjects for the year 1572.

As to what passed in this Parliament in regard to the affairs of the Church, Strype has given so circumstantial an account (principally after D'Ewes), in the seventh chapter of his *Annals of the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth*, vol. ii. that we can do no better than refer the reader to his important pages. How far the Government was in danger from Papists on one hand, and from Puritans

on the other, may be well judged, from two Protestations drawn up, by authority as it is thought of the *Synod*, to be tendered to persons of both those sects, in the one of which the Papist was expected to declare that the Queen held her crown independently of the sentence of any Pope or Bishop; and in the other the Puritan was to be called upon equally to renounce a deposing power, in any Church, *Synod*, *Consistory*, or Ecclesiastical Assembly. The two forms may be seen in Collier, ii. 532. and Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, b. iv. ch. v.\*

In this Parliament an effort was made (the last effort, says Strype), to bring into practice, by authority of Parliament, the body of ecclesiastical and civil laws, which had been so long contemplated,† and nearly brought to a conclusion, and promulgated for public use, in the reign of Edward VI.—Care had been taken to have it printed before the meeting of Parliament, and it was introduced into the house by Mr. Norton, in hopes of procuring attention to it, but without effect. It was supposed to have a tendency to trench upon the Queen's prerogative,‡ and being mixed up with other proceedings that gave her offence, it fell to the ground. Great care had been bestowed upon this important work in the times of King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI., being designed to supersede and take the place of all that rubbish of Popish Canons and Constitutions, which by the Reformation had been virtually abrogated. Dr. Haddon and Sir John Cheke, had employed their pens, in turning this seasonable and much wanted Codex into elegant Latin, in the reign of Edward VI. and it had now been printed with a large preface supplied by Fox, but as Strype, in his life of Parker adds, “all that good pains is lost and fallen to the ground.” The Codex itself, however, of which we have given a pretty large account in our first volume, p. 338. still remains; Lord Burghley was among the persons originally chosen to assist in its compilation.§

\* The following curious passage occurs, in the secret Memoirs of Dudley Earl of Leicester.—“Whereas by the common distinction now received in speech, there are *three* notable differences of religion in the land, the *two extremes* whereof are the *Papists* and the *Puritans*, and the religious *Protestant* obtaining the mean, this fellow [Lord L.] being of neither, maketh his gain of all: and as he seeketh a kingdom by the one extreame, and spoil by the other, so he useth the authority of the third, to compass the first two, and the countermines of each to the overthrow of all three.”—p. 15.

† Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum.

‡ Collier, ii. 530.

§ This Noble Lord appears to have been constantly appealed to as much on affairs relating to the Church, as on such as concerned the State.—Some Papists, it seems, about this time had been cavil-



In the latter end of this year was fought the famous battle of Lepanto, where the Spaniards, under the command of Don John of Austria, (natural son of Charles V.) obtained so signal a victory over the Turks, that all Christian Princes seem to have been expected to rejoice at it, without regard to any intervening circumstances. Elizabeth accordingly issued special directions to the Lord Mayor, to cause this triumph of Christendom, over the Mahometans, to be celebrated by bonfires and all other tokens of joy and thanksgiving, the minutes of the Council's letter upon this occasion, being corrected and enlarged by the pen of Lord Burghley. England, however, had no great cause to rejoice at this great increase of the reputation and power of Spain, nor France either; and therefore Walsingham wisely enough observes in his letter to Lord Leicester, from Paris, November 7, 1571, "Whatsoever show the King here giveth of joy outwardly, inwardly he doth not best like of the victory, as that thing which addeth too great an increase to the reputation of the King of Spain. I think therefore," he adds, "no time more fit to treat of amity [that is, between England and France] than the present."—*Digges*, 150.; but this very victory impeded such negotiations; for both Charles IX. and Catherine de Medicis, seem to have been struck with this accession to the credit of Spain, and as the latter (Catherine de Medicis) was, as Walsingham says, of nature fearful, it laid her more open to the intrigues of the Spanish party in France. The victory, however, was celebrated as a *Christian* triumph, and there we must leave it,\* only

ling at the reference made to St. Augustine in the xxixth of the Church Articles, concerning *the wicked that eat not the body of Christ*. Archbishop Parker was responsible for the citation, and Lord Burghley did not omit to apprise him of the objections that had been started. The Archbishop lost no time in examining again the passage cited, and seeing no reason to alter his opinion, wrote to Lord Burghley to tell him so, alleging in further support of what he had done, the opinion of *Prosper* in his *book of Sentences*. The Archbishop, we may observe, might also have appealed to Origen, St. Cyprian and Basil, all of whom, as Bishop Beveridge has shewn, maintain the doctrine asserted in the Article, which Article indeed, as well as the xxxth, was added to those of Edward VI. in the year 1562. It is, however, very curious that the subject should thus have been brought before the *Lord Treasurer of England*.

\* Some things however with regard to this celebrated battle are very noticeable. It was, as Voltaire has observed, the first time that the Standard of the Cross Keys was displayed against the Crescent, and the Roman galleys dared to encounter those of the Ottoman Porte. Mark Anthony Colonna, Admiral of the Pope's galleys, was next in command to Don John of Austria. The Port of Lepanto, where the two fleets met, was the ancient Naupactus, not far from Corinth. Never since the battle of Actium, had the Grecian seas beheld so numerous a fleet, nor so memorable an engagement. The Ottoman galleys were rowed by Christian slaves, and the Christian

observing, that one of Lord Burghley's celebrated contemporaries, Cervantes, the immortal author of *Don Quixote*, served as a private soldier in this famous conflict, and lost his left hand there.\*

In the Christmas holidays of this year, 1571, Anne, the eldest daughter of Lord Burghley, a young lady of singular accomplishments,† was married to the Earl of Oxford. The Queen honoured the marriage with her presence,‡ and great hopes seemed to be entertained of its proving a fortunate and happy connexion. Lord Burghley, writing to Sir Francis Walsingham on the very day of the ceremony says, "I can write no more for lack of leisure, being occasioned at this time to write divers ways, and not unoccupied with feasting my friends at the marriage of my daughter, who is this day married to the Earl of Oxford to my comfort, by reason of the Queen's Majesty, who hath very honourably with her presence and great favour accompanied it." But his Lordship's expectations were deceived; it was by no means a happy marriage, as we shall have occasion to notice hereafter.—A circumstance the more to be lamented, because the lady had had two other proposals of marriage made to her; first by Sir Henry Sidney, for his only son, the very celebrated and highly accomplished Sir Philip Sidney; and secondly by the Earl of Shrewsbury for his son, but which had been declined by Lord Burghley for reasons which will be stated elsewhere. Though we must reserve much of what we have to say of the unworthy husband of this unfortunate Lady, for another place, yet as his character had something in it very peculiar, we shall add the following sketch of it from the interesting work of Miss Aikin, *Memoirs of the Court of Elizabeth*.

by Turkish, both serving, contrary to their will, against their country. The Ottoman Admiral, whose name was Ali, was taken with his galley, his head struck off, and put on the top of his own flag. The Pope, hearing of this victory, with some point, but little delicacy or discretion, alluding to Don John the Commander, cried out, "*There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.*" The victory however, after all, was of very little importance to Christendom.

\* Dict. Historique, art. Cervantes.

† "She was a most virtuous Lady," says Strype, "bred up at Court, and instructed in good literature, by one Lewin, afterwards a learned doctor of the civil law; who in a letter to the Lord her father, speaks of her *ingenii et naturæ bonitas*, i. e. goodness of wit and nature, derived from her father."

‡ Among the entries in Lord Burghley's Journal, is the following: "Aug. 3, 1571, the Erle of Oxford declared to the Queen's Majesty at Hampton Court his desire to match with my daughter Anne; whereto the Queen assented: so did the Duke of Norfolk, being then a prisoner in his own house, called Howard House."

“ Edward, Earl of Oxford, was the seventeenth of the illustrious family of Vere, who had borne that title ; and his character presented an extraordinary union of the haughtiness, violence, and impetuosity of the feudal Baron, with many of the elegant propensities and mental accomplishments which adorn the Nobleman of a happier age. It was, probably, to his travels in Italy that he owed his more refined taste both in literature and in luxury ; and it was thence that he brought those perfumed and embroidered gloves which he was the first to introduce into England ;\* a superb pair, which he presented to her Majesty, were so much approved by her, that she sat for her portrait with them on her hands. This Earl enjoyed, in his own times, a high poetical reputation ; but his once celebrated comedies have perished, and two or three fugitive pieces, inserted in collections, are the only legacy bequeathed to posterity by his Muse. In the chivalrous exercises of the tilt and tournament, the Earl of Oxford had few superiors ; he was victor in the justs both of this year [1571]† and of the year 1580, when he was led by two ladies into the presence-chamber, all armed as he was, to receive a prize from her Majesty’s own hand.” But we must have done with this Noble Lord for the present.‡

The account of the Queen’s Progresses this year, in which she was generally accompanied by Lord Burghley,§ is as follows :

“ Jan. 3, 1570-1. The Queen dined with Sir Thomas Gresham, in Bishops-gate Street, and gave name to the Royal Exchange.” [See an account of this

\* Among the Burghley papers, by Haynes, is a letter from Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, in France, to Sir Thomas Chaloner, Ambassador in Spain, in which the latter is asked, in terms of singular earnestness, to send “ two pair of perfumed gloves, perfumed with orange flowers and jasmin ; the one for my wife’s hand, the other for my own.”

† The royal challenge (as it was called), in 1571, appears to have been a magnificent spectacle. As Lord Oxford was among the challengers, so was Thomas Cecil, Lord Burghley’s eldest son, afterwards Earl of Exeter, one of the defenders ; who appears to have borne away a prize. The account we have of this curious ceremony is briefly as follows (after naming distinctly the challengers and defenders): “ This triumph continued three days ; the first at tilt, the second at turney, and the third at the barrier. On every of the challengers her Majesty bestowed a prize, for the receiving whereof, they were particularly led, armed, by two ladies, unto her presence-chamber. The prize at the tilt, on the defenders party, was given unto Henry Gray ; at the tournay, to the Lord Henry Seamor ; at the barriers, to Thomas Cecil. Before them went Clarencieux, King of Armes, in his rich coate of arms. This magnificent triumph was performed anno 1571.”—Nichols, ii. 334.

‡ See more about him, Aikin, ii. 6, 7 ; Strype’s Annals, ii. 178, 179 ; and Peck’s *Desiderata Curiosa*, vol. i. 27.

§ See his Diary.



dinner and ceremony of Sir Thomas Gresham, and the Royal Exchange, Aikin's *Memoirs of the Court of Q. Elizabeth*, vol. ii.]

"On the 1st, 2d, and 3d of May, a solemn just was holden at Westminster, where the chief honours were borne away by Edward, Earl of Oxford, of whom we have just spoken. In the summer the Queen went into Essex.

"Aug. 7. The Q. was at Hatfield; and on the 2d of September, at Audley End, belonging to the Howards, then called Audley Inn. [See a curious account of the expences \* attending this visit, Nichols, i. 280.]

"On the 5th of September, the Q. was at Horeham Hall." [The seat of Sir John Cutts.]

"From the 14th to the 17th of September the Queen was entertained at Mark Hall [Viscount Hereford, afterwards Earl of Essex]; and on the 18th at Lees, the mansion of the Lord Rich,† whence she proceeded to Hunsdon House."

This visit is supposed to be represented in Vertue's "*Historic Prints*," an engraving well known.‡ The Queen appears in a canopy chair, borne by six gentlemen. Among the great Lords attending her, Lord *Burghley* is represented with his wand, as Lord High Treasurer, an office to which he was advanced about this time, on the death of the Marquis of Winchester. The whole picture, which Vertue supposes to have been painted by Mark Gerrard, is well described in Nichols, chiefly from notes by Vertue himself. Lord Hunsdon appears in it, carrying the Sword of State: he was first cousin to the Queen.§

"Sept. 21.¶ The Queen's Majesty came to *Theobald's* [the seat of Lord Burghley] where some verses were presented to her Majesty, with a portrait of the house.

\* Among these are "for three sugar loaves, presented to my Lord of Leycester, my L. *Burleigh*, and Sir Thomas Smith, 37s. 8d."

† See an account of this beautiful place, Nichols, i. 99.

‡ Among these historic prints is one also from a picture referable to those times, we mean the representation of the Lennox family, the original of which is said to have been painted by order of the Earl of Lennox, father of Lord Darnley, containing many allusions to the death of the latter; and insinuations against Mary as privy to the murder. The picture from which the engraving is taken, is, or was, in his Majesty's palace at Kensington.

§ See an account of him in Nichols, i. 284.

¶ Sept. 21, 1571. Hugh Fitz William writes to the Countess of Shrewsbury, "Thei say the Quene wil be at my Lorde of Burlyis house besides Waltam on Sunday nexte, wheare my Lord of Oxford shall marry Mrs. Anne Sicelle, his daughter."— Hunter's *Hallamshire*, p. 83. [Nichols.]

“ Sept. 22. Still at *Theobald's*, and thence to St. James's.

“ Oct. at Richmond. Which last place finished her progress.”

As her Majesty visited no house so often as *Theobald's*, we shall have further occasion to speak of it: at present it will be sufficient to observe, after Nichols, that the original of this very celebrated seat was a small moated house; but in the year 1560, Sir William Cecil began to build on a new site, designing to erect only a moderate sized mansion, as the residence of his younger son, little foreseeing that *that younger son* would so soon tread in his own steps, and make a fortune for himself. The Queen's continual visits (for we shall have to speak of many), induced him greatly to enlarge upon his original plans.\* In Norden's Hertfordshire, the place is thus noticed: “ To speak of the beauty of this most stately house at large as it deserveth, for curious buildings, delightful walks, and pleasant conceits within and without, and other things very glorious and elegant to be seen, would challenge a great portion of this little treatise; and, therefore, lest I should come short of that due commendation that it deserveth, I leave it, as indeed it is, a princely seat.”

\* See Lord B.'s own account of this, Nichols, i. 205. Among the entries in his Diary, it appears from one, that it was in the year 1570, May 15, that Lord Burghley “ bought Cheshunt Park of Mr. Harrington.”

## CHAP. XIII.

1572.

Fourteenth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, began November 17, 1571.

*Treaty of peace with France—Intrigues against Elizabeth—Indictment and trial of the Duke of Norfolk—Execution of Mather and Berny for a Conspiracy against Lord Burghley—The Spanish faction much annoyed by the discovery—Death of the Marquis of Winchester, and Lord Burghley made Treasurer—Proceedings in Parliament against the Queen of Scots—Puritans busy—Seaton's Embassy—The Queen pressed by her Parliament to bring Mary to trial—Letter of Lord Burghley to Sir F. Walsingham—Duke of Norfolk executed—League with France—Duke of Montmorency comes over—Cecil Knight of the Garter—Extract from Lord Burghley's Life, by a Domestic—Massacre of St. Bartholomew—Letters from Lord Burghley to Sir F. Walsingham on the Massacre—from Lord Leicester—and from Sir T. Smith—French Ambassador—Resentment manifested in England on account of the Massacre—Proposal of Catherine de Medicis to meet Elizabeth—Mason Fleur, the French Ambassador—Elizabeth requested to stand Godmother to the daughter of Charles IX.—Death of John Knox—Summary of Scotch affairs—Secret instructions to Killegrew on his being sent to Scotland—Lord Burghley's Letters from Woodstock—Defence of Mary's honour—Comparison of Leslie and Buchanan—Disgrace of Mary—Detectio Mariæ—Intrigues of the Papists—Disciplinarians—Admonition to Parliament—Dering's Address—Archbishop Parker's Bible—Bishop Parkhurst—Extract from Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker—Queen's Progresses.*

STRYPE, in his Life of Archbishop Parker, begins his account of the year we are now entering upon, by calling it "a year of much action;" and though indeed in giving it that appellation, he refers chiefly, as more connected with his subject, to the dangers incurred by the *Church of England*, from the Papists on the one hand and the Dissenters on the other, which gave the Archbishop great trouble (and we may safely add his friend Lord Burghley no less), yet had he



extended his observation to what was passing generally throughout Europe, he could not well have devised terms more descriptive of the busy, perplexing, deceitful proceedings, and violent transactions of this eventful period.

The first entry this year in Lord Burghley's own Diary, according to the historical reckoning, is as follows :

"January 3.—Charles, the French King, gave commission to the D. *Montmorency*, the President *Byrge*, the Bishop of *Limoges*, and Mons. *de Foix*, to treat of a firm peace with the Queen of England's deputies ;" and on the 9th of February following, the correspondent commission sent over by Elizabeth to Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Francis Walsingham, and Killebrew (the brother-in-law of Lord B.) to make peace with Charles IX. is equally noticed.

Having spoken before of this peace, and the dissimulation of the French Court in negotiating it,\* we shall proceed to the next most memorable circumstance, the trial of the Duke of Norfolk, which took place in Westminster Hall on the 16th of January, 1571-2.—Into the particulars of this trial it could be to no purpose for us to enter at present, except to observe, that as it was the occasion of bringing to further light the intrigues against the Queen's Majesty, on the part of Mary, in conjunction with Spain and the Pope, it could not well fail to be also the occasion of some harsher measures in regard to that unfortunate Princess, and some strokes of policy, more needful, perhaps, than creditable ; for we wish to be understood as seeking rather to *account for* what came to pass, than to vindicate in all points the course of proceeding ; though we must again repeat that in the struggle of *politics*, plots and stratagems must be expected to engender and produce plots and stratagems, as mines in warfare produce countermines.—We say this, more for the sake of meeting at once the heavy charges advanced against Lord Burghley, by the advocates of Mary, especially in regard to certain transactions of this year, than for any other purpose. We certainly take

\* This dissimulation was continued throughout ; on the 1st of March, 1572, Walsingham had a conference with Charles IX., upon the subject of the treaty, during which that perfidious Monarch often told him, that he might rely on all he said, for that he had rather die than falsify his word, or break a promise. Great endeavours seem to have been made by the French Court at this time to procure Lord Leicester or Lord Burghley, or both, to be sent to Paris by Elizabeth, as her Ministers, to conclude the league of amity. To induce her to do this Montmorency was specially selected to be sent to her, no man being more agreeable on many accounts to the English, and to Elizabeth. It is conjectured, and not unreasonably, that mischief was intended to the two Lords, could they have prevailed upon Elizabeth to send them. The peace was concluded at Blois on the 19th of April.—See Lord Burghley's Diary in Murdin.

no delight in intrigues, plots, or stratagems; but where they are alleged to have been resorted to, by opposite parties, those that can be shewn to have been adopted *defensively* only, may surely be expected to appear the most innocent or justifiable, and we are confident in our own minds, that against Elizabeth, as Queen of England, and Head of the Protestant Church of England (we might almost add of *Europe*), incessant intrigues were going forward; and from which, nothing but the perpetual vigilance, foresight, prudence, and courage of her faithful ministers and counsellors, could possibly have defended her.\*

The terms used in the indictment of the Duke of Norfolk, as it is to be seen in the State Trials, are exceedingly well calculated to shew the extent of the Queen's danger from the Northern Rebellion, and from the intrigues of Ridolpho and the Bishop of Ross, as the secret or avowed agents of the *Pope*, the *King of Spain*, the Duke of *Alva*, and the *Queen of Scots*. The Duke himself, perhaps, being but the dupe† and blind instrument of the several parties we have mentioned; of his extreme *rashness* and *imprudence* in suffering himself to be so deeply implicated in such treasonable practices, there can be no doubt, especially considering the solemn and voluntary assurances he had given the Queen to the contrary; but implicated‡ to a very great degree he certainly was; and as generally happens in such cases, betrayed by some of his guilty confederates.§

\* Mr. Turner, whose work on the reign of Elizabeth, as we before observed, has appeared since the above was written, has been at great pains to trace what he calls the "*Papal Conspiracy*," against England during the pontificate of Pius V., who died this very year.—He concludes that the Northern Rebellion in 1569 was a branch of it, and that Norfolk and Mary were constantly engaged in carrying on the design; he refers principally to the Lives of that Pontiff by *Catena*, *Gabutius*, and *Fuenmayor*; to some MS. letters of the French minister, Fenelon, in the hands of Mr. Murray, and to the celebrated letters of Pius V., by *Goubau*; of which letters he has given an excellent summary, calculated abundantly to prove, that, to use Mr. Turner's own words, "the spirit and aim of Pius extended to the gigantic effect of exterminating as soon as possible *all the Protestants in Europe*."—Having alluded to the death of Pius, we cannot forbear adding to the above the short account of that event by Professor *Walch*, of *Gottingen*. After speaking of the *horrid principles* Pius had imbibed in the schools of the *Inquisition*, and *tenaciously followed* when Pope, he concludes, "At length he died on the first of May, 1572. Pope Clement VIII. pronounced him *blessed*, and Clement XI. *canonized* him."

† Mr. Turner, in his late publication, inclines to think he was treacherous from the beginning of his negotiations about the marriage with Mary.

‡ See Haynes, 597, 598.

§ Particularly the Bishop of Ross, whose testimony bore hard against him.—See his several examinations in Murdin, under the year 1571—signed with his own hand.

But as this year terminated the life of this unhappy Nobleman, that “very worthy, useful, and beloved peer of the realm,” as Strype calls him, we shall reserve what we have further to say of him till that event is brought before us in due order of time.

In the month of February of this year, two persons of the names of Mather and Berny [or Verny], underwent the sentence of the law, for a conspiracy to assassinate\* the eminent Minister, whose life we are recording, and, as it was nearly proved, the Queen’s Majesty also; in order to further the escape and preserve the life of the Duke of Norfolk, and set Mary of Scots on the throne; being instigated, and even hired for these wicked purposes, according to their own confession, by *Borgest*, Secretary to the Spanish Ambassador; but the accused having, in the presence of Lord Leicester, the Secretary [according to *Strype*], and Sir Walter Mildmay, denied all concern in it, as well on the part of his master, the Ambassador, who was alleged to be privy to it, as on his own, it so exasperated Mather, that he offered to maintain his words *con la spada*, with the sword.†

\* Lord Burghley received the following notice of the plot from one of the conspirators, Herle probably, who impeached the others.—See *Strype’s Life of Parker*, ii. 101. *Mather*, however, professed to have *written* it.

“To the Lord Burley, by the Post of London, Jan. 4, 1571.

“My Lord,—Of late I have, upon discontent, entered into conspiracy with some others, to slay your Lordship; and the time appointed; a man with a perfect hand attended you there several times in your garden to have slain your Lordship. The which, not falling out, and continuing in the former mischief, the height of your study-window is taken towards the garden, minding, if they miss these means, to slay you with a shot upon the terrace, or else in coming late from the court with a pistolet. And being touched with some remorse of so bloody a deed, in discharge of my conscience before God, I warn your Lordship of their evil and desperate meaning. I require your Lordship, in God’s name, to have care of your safety.

“To the Right Honourable my Lord of Burley, at the Court, in haste.”

† “Mather hath in presence of my Lord of Leicester, Mr. Treasurer, Mr. Mildmay, manfully charged Borgest, the Spanish Ambassador’s Secretary, that his master and he both, enticed Mather to murder me, and Borgest denying it, Mather hath offered to try it *con la spada*.”—Letter from Lord Burghley to Sir F. Walsingham, Jan. 23, 1571-2. The above differs from Strype in saying that this passed in the presence of Lord Leicester, the *Treasurer*, and Sir W. Mildmay; perhaps, however, it may agree in the person, as Lord Burghley was both Secretary and Treasurer in the course of the present year. Mather is reported, by his confederate Berny, to have spoken very indignantly of some of the Queen’s favourites. “What a pity were it, that so noble a man as the Duke should die in so vile a woman’s days, that desireth to cut off such of her Nobility as were not perfumed and courtlike to please her delicate eye, and place such as were for her turn, meaning *dancers*, and meaning *you* my Lord of Leicester, and one Mr. Hatton.” The examinations of these con-



The discovery of this conspiracy seems greatly to have discomfited the Spanish party, who hated Lord Burghley more than any other, for the continual protection, afforded by his counsel and vigilance, to the Queen's person and crown;\* a circumstance well proved by the following remarks of one Derbyshire, a Jesuit, who being at Paris, and known to hold intelligence with the English Papists at Louvain, as well as with the friends of the Scottish Queen, Walsingham found out; and causing one to go to him under pretence of being a Catholic, and interested for the success of any measures taken against Elizabeth; this agent drew from him the following confession: pretending to lament to Derbyshire, the ill state of Mary's affairs in Scotland, and to be much disappointed at the discovery of Mather's enterprise, the Jesuit answered, "That the ill handling of matters was the cause that they took no better effect; but bade him notwithstanding, to be of good comfort, and assure himself that there were more *Mather's* than one in England, which would not scruple, when time should conveniently serve, to adventure their lives in seeking to acquit us of that lewd woman (meaning her Majesty); for, said he, if she were gone, then would the hedge lie open; whereby the good Queen, that is now the prisoner, in whom rested, he said, the *present* right of this crown, should easily enjoy the same; for besides that all the Catholics in the realm of England were at her devotion, there were, said he [and thanked God], divers heretics that were well affected towards her;† which was no small miracle, that God had so blinded their eyes, that they should be so inclined to her, that in the end would yield unto them their just deserts, unless they returned to the Catholic faith. For if she were once possessed of the crown of England, it would be the only way to reform all Christendom in reducing them to the Catholic faith." Walsingham confesses that he was anxious to make these inquiries, "that her Majesty might see how much they build upon the possibility of that dangerous woman, whose life is a step to her Majesty's death, for that they repute her for an undoubtable conspirators and hired assassins, as they are preserved in Murdin, are very curious, and deserving of the reader's attention; and we are now able to refer to Mr. Turner's very diligent and judicious summing up, not only of the evidences of their murderous designs, but of the testimony adduced in proof of the several steps and discoveries, taken and made, in the famous *Ridolfian* conspiracy, and which terminated in the execution of the too guilty Duke of Norfolk.—See his *Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, book ii. ch. 30.

\* Pius V. in writing to the Duke of Alva, to aid the *English* Catholics, in their designs against the Protestants adds, "et contra *illam* quæ se pro *angliæ regina* gerit."

† The Papists appear to have made friends even in the Queen's household, and among her guards.—See *Catena's Life of Pius V.*

cessor, or rather (which is a more danger) for a *right inheritor*.”—*Digges*, 172. This man ventured to foretell, notwithstanding the failure of Mather’s enterprise, that some such events would come to pass, “*ere a year were at an end* ;” spoke very ungraciously of the Queen, and very bitterly against the Lords Leicester and Burghley.

It is curious that while the Papists were so mortified and discomfited with this discovery, Lord Burghley should have received from the celebrated *Beza*, a letter full of *congratulations* upon the same occasion. He “could not refrain himself,” he said, “from testifying by his present letters, what joy they all conceived there [at Geneva], and with how great earnestness they gave thanks to God, when to the many other benefits he vouchsafed this nation, they understood this new one had accrued, namely the Queen’s deliverance from that extraordinary and imminent danger; and not the deliverance of her Majesty only, but of her faithful Counsellors, and in effect of the whole English realm; being the *chief* among *truly Christian kingdoms*, and the *common refuge* of Christian *exiles*. And when this benefit did more particularly belong to him (Lord Burghley) as being the man against whom those profligate wretches aimed by name, they did especially congratulate him herein, beseeching God, that all the Churches of Christ, might long enjoy the fruit of so great a mercy.”

On the 10th of March, the following entry occurs in Lord Burghley’s Diary.

“Ws. Marchio *Wynton*, Thes. Angliæ, obiit quum esset ætatis 87 annorum.”

This was that time-serving old Nobleman, the Marquis of Winchester, that “*bending willow*,” as he called himself, who had served many Princes, fashioning himself to all changes, in Church and State, under Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. The great office he held, of Lord High Treasurer of the kingdom, was upon this vacancy reserved by her Majesty for Lord *Burghley*, though his actual appointment did not take place till four (some say *six*) months\* afterwards; four, however, must be the most correct, if we may believe Lord Burghley himself, for in his Diary it is thus entered :

“July 15. Lord Burghley made Lord Treasurer of England. 14 Eliz. 1572.”

The extraordinary case of the Duke of Norfolk, as might very naturally have been expected, turned the attention of the anti-catholic subjects of her Majesty to the intrigues of her illustrious prisoner, the Queen of Scots; it was impossible

\* Stowe and Hollinshed date the appointment on the 13th of July, 1572; Rymer, Sept. 15. of the same year. It is hazardous to rely implicitly, on any dates in the historians of this period; Lord Burghley himself is not always right, as his Diary appears in Murdin.

not to see, that there were no enemies of Elizabeth and of England, with whom she was not willing to associate herself, to procure her deliverance and release. An open and honest resentment of the restraints she endured, might have been forgiven, but a clandestine correspondence with the Queen's *greatest enemies*, tending to *rebellion*, and an *actual invasion of the kingdom by foreign powers*, could not be overlooked. However innocent the Duke of Norfolk might have supposed himself to be, of "maliciously and traitorously conspiring, imagining, and going about not only to deprive, depose, and cast out the Queen, his sovereign lady, from her royal dignity, title, power, and government of her kingdom of England," as his indictment ran, "but also to bring about and compass the death and final destruction of his said Sovereign, to raise sedition, and spread a miserable civil war; to endeavour a change of religion, and bring in aliens and foreigners to subvert the constitution now so happily instituted and established;" yet that all these things were in the view of his associates and confederates it was impossible to doubt;\* and as he had been drawn into the vortex of these extensive conspiracies, by his imprudent yielding to the suspicious propositions made to him, of marrying Mary, it was equally impossible totally to separate the cases. Norfolk's trial, which ought to be read by all persons desirous of understanding the complexity of the intrigues carrying on against Elizabeth, had brought to light many revolting circumstances on the part of Mary and her agents. All which, coupled with the alarm of Popery, in case of her success against Elizabeth, laid the foundation for very turbulent proceedings in Parliament as soon as it should meet, and it had received a summons to assemble for business on the 8th of May.† But we must digress a little here, to meet another severe charge against the subject of this Memoir.

\* The Duke was son of the celebrated Earl of Surrey, executed under Henry VIII., under pretence that by quartering the royal arms of England, he aspired to the crown. The family had been zealously attached to the Romish Religion, till the present Duke embraced, under Elizabeth, the Protestant faith. This, however, was not enough to clear him of suspicions in such a case of conspiracy; which had in view to restore the Popish religion; for that this was the great object appears from the Life of Pius V., by *Hieronymo Catena*, who makes that Pontiff to glory in having been the promoter of the conspiracy, and in having sent Ridolpho into England to stir up the English to rebel against Elizabeth. — See *Rapin*, viii. 1572.

† Strype falls into the mistake of calling this the 13th of Elizabeth, but it was the 14th year of her reign. This was the Queen's fourth Parliament, and first session of that Parliament which was continued by sundry prorogations, to the 23d year of her Majesty's reign, there being three sessions in all, viz. this of 1572, 1575, and 1580.



There is a letter extant from Lord Burghley to Lord Shrewsbury, which being evidently written at the Queen's command, has been judged to reflect indelible disgrace on all the parties, by Mr. Lodge, an author to whom we are so highly indebted for many valuable illustrations of British history. The letter, it seems, was intended to convey directions to Lord Shrewsbury for reducing the Queen of Scots' attendants to the number of sixteen persons; and it urges his Lordship to hold discourse with that Queen, upon the subject of the intrigues that had been brought to light, and of which there could be no longer any doubt, but the letter must be made to speak for itself; or rather the *postscript* to the Queen's letter, for so it appears to have been.

"After I had enclosed up these letters, her Majesty willed me to let your Lordship understand that she would have you use some speech to the Queen of Scots in this sort: that it is now fully discovered to her Majesty what practices that Queen has had in hand, both with the Duke of Norfolk and others, upon the sending away of Ridolpho into Spain, and though it is known to her Majesty by writings, extant, how she was in deliberation what were best for her to do for her escape out of this realm, and thereof caused the Duke of Norfolk to be conferred withal, and that she made choice rather to go into Spain than into Scotland or France, yet her Majesty thinketh it no just cause to be offended with, those devices tending to her liberty; neither is she offended with her purposes to offer her son in marriage to the King of Spain's daughter, in which matter the late Queen of Spain had solicited her; neither that she sought to make the King of Spain believe that she would give ear to the offer of Don John of Austria: but the very matter of offence is, that her Majesty understandeth certainly her labours and devices to stir up a new rebellion in this realm, and to have the King of Spain to assist it; and finding the said Queen now so bent, she must not think but that her Majesty hath cause to alter her courteous dealings with her. And so in this sort her Majesty would have you tempt her patience, to provoke her to answer somewhat, for of all these premises, her Majesty is certainly assured, and much more."

Mr. Lodge's note is as follows: "We have here the Prime Minister of a powerful and wise Monarch, directing, by her order, one of the first Noblemen of the realm to visit the cell of a prisoner, and to exercise the office of a spy of the Inquisition, by artfully drawing the proofs of the prisoner's guilt from her own mouth. The terms in which this treacherous mandate is couched aggravate the idea of its turpitude. The Earl, deep in the secrets of her story, already master

of all the known evidence against her, is ordered not only to sift her by artful questions, but to assail her passions, and to work upon the weakness of a feminine temper which had been rendered infinitely irritable by a long series of misfortunes—in a word, ‘to tempt her patience to provoke her to utter somewhat;’ what a frightful addition is this to the horrors of Mary’s prison.”

It is impossible to attribute this note to any less pure motive, than a strong feeling for Mary, whose case, at all events, was very deplorable, but in a history like the present, where the character of one of the parties at least, is deeply implicated, something perhaps may be advanced, to palliate such very heavy charges as the above. And first, we would observe that the Queen had already, in the course of this very year,\* almost offended her Parliament by refusing to bring Mary to trial, upon evidence judged to be quite sufficient to convict her of treason, the Parliament having besides taken pains to shew, that both by Scripture and the civil law, she would be warranted in taking such a step.† Elizabeth, therefore, could not be seeking to draw a confession of guilt from Mary, merely for such sanguinary purposes as the note insinuates, by making Lord Shrewsbury exercise the office of a *spy of the Inquisition*. And as to visiting the *cell of a prisoner*, Mary lived in the same house with Lord Shrewsbury himself, justly called one of the first Noblemen of the realm, and what was the purport of Elizabeth’s letter? merely to enforce a *reduction* of Mary’s attendants (in consequence of the extensive intrigues to which she had undoubtedly been privy, using her servants as instruments against Elizabeth), to the number of *sixteen*—a large number for a *prisoner’s cell*! But even for this, Elizabeth seems to have wished to make excuses, allowing that many things might have been overlooked, had not the intrigues discovered, involved a rebellion against her person and Government. Upon all which points Mary had so grossly prevaricated, that Elizabeth was left to bear all the blame of harshness, without the slightest acknowledgment of an error on Mary’s part. And to shew how plausibly, without denying any of the facts of the late conspiracy,‡ she could varnish over her

\* The Queen’s letter was written in September.

† See Walsingham’s letter to Sir Thomas Smith, Aug. 10, 1572.—*Digges*, 232.

‡ It seems utterly impossible to expect any agreement between authors who happen to disagree upon the leading points of this melancholy case. In Murdin, p. 118. may be seen a list of charges against Mary, signed by Lord Burghley, which Dr. Gilbert Stuart represents to have been most cruelly and insultingly advanced at this time, and seems to think Mary, by her behaviour, greatly invalidated all those charges, by still insisting on being admitted to Eliza-

tale (we are only seeking to do justice to the accused), she pleaded, in defence of her renewed proceedings towards the Duke of Norfolk, that if she had not renounced the marriage, it was because she was contracted to the Duke ; that she thought herself obliged, by *the love of a wife*, to warn him of the danger he was in, and to persuade him to make his escape ; forgetting, as it has been well observed, that the contract with the Duke, to which she referred, had been entered into while her third husband, Bothwell, was yet alive ; and as to the “love of a wife,” how could that be, when they had never met since the contract, and it had been the chief charge against Norfolk on his trial, that in seeking such a marriage he must have looked towards the crown, because the *love of a husband* could not be his motive, since he had *often acknowledged* that he had an *ill* opinion of her, accounting her a *wicked woman*, an *adulteress*, and *murderer* ; for some such expressions he acknowledged to have used, before he had consented to the marriage. We shall proceed no further at present.—Elizabeth was too wise not to see through such shallow excuses, and might expect some more ingenuous proceedings when it became notorious that every thing had been discovered ; but Mary was accustomed to be on her guard, professing that she would not utter many things she *knew*, unless admitted to a *personal* conference with Elizabeth. On this point, which she must have known to be so obnoxious,\* she continually insisted, as an excuse for her reserve.

Of all the friends to the Reformation, it must be generally admitted, that those who had been disciplined in the school of Geneva, were the most rigid avengers of any open breach of the laws of morality, the most regardless of worldly distinctions, and the most jealous of any purely ecclesiastical authority. The admission of lay elders into their consistories, was an encouragement to *all* persons to intermeddle with the affairs of the Church, and the republican principles of the Genevese, as a body politic, naturally gave them a distaste for royalty, if at all associated in their ideas, with corrupt, profligate, or loose moral principles. Mary had rendered herself particularly obnoxious to all such persons amongst her Majesty's subjects, and as there were many about the

beth's presence, or to be heard before Parliament ; but we cannot put the same interpretation on what passed. Some of the charges, as *old* charges, might have been omitted, but most of them, we think, were far from being exaggerated, and Mary's answer to them, evasive.

\* “But the admission of their Queen to Elizabeth's presence, as it had been refused from the beginning, was the more strenuously urged, because they were well assured that it could not be obtained.”—*Malcolm Laing*.



Court, there were many also to be found in the Lower House of the new Parliament; so that as soon as it met, two attempts were made, first, to advance the strictest and most rigid principles of the Reformation, by interfering with the rites and ceremonies of the established Church, and secondly, by invoking condign punishment on the head of the offending Queen of Scots.

On the first of these two heads, the Queen seems to have thought that it was not only interfering with her prerogative, but with the just rights of the Convocation, with whom all ecclesiastical laws and regulations ought to originate, and when approved and sanctioned by the Legislature, be generally obeyed. On the second head, we have little more to say, than that the attempts to bring the Queen of Scots to trial and punishment were at this time quite ineffectual. Some persons, we are aware, will be very loath to attribute it to any clemency, lenity, or tender feelings on the part of Elizabeth, but the issue of things is certainly very remarkable, namely, That having been almost reproached by her Parliament for a dangerous lenity, and urged to bring things to extremity at this time, by the public trial and eventual condemnation of Mary, she not only disregarded these representations, but, that they might not be very speedily renewed, dismissed her Parliament for the long interval, as it turned out, of three years.\* We are quite at a loss to reconcile this, with the charges of barbarous cruelty and unrelenting malice, brought against Elizabeth by the professed advocates of Mary; we have read their charges, weighed their arguments, and what is more perhaps than all, carefully looked to the spiteful

\* In 1575 this was actually brought forward in Parliament as a *charge against Elizabeth*, by Wentworth, M. P. for Tregony. "So certain it was," said he, "that none was without fault; no not our noble *Queen*: sith then (viz. 1572) her Majesty had committed *great fault*, yea *dangerous fault* to herself." That fault was, says Strype, that she would not yield to the trial much less execution of Mary Queen of Scots, her prisoner; which in this same session they were very busy about. In January of this year, before the trial of the Duke of Norfolk, and consequently before his execution, towards which, as we shall have to shew, she manifested great reluctance, Lord Burghley, writing to Walsingham, says, "The Queen's Majesty has been always a merciful Lady, and by mercy she hath taken more harm than by justice, and yet she thinks she is more beloved in doing herself harm." As this occurs in the very letter in which he mentions the conspiracy of Mather, backed by the Spanish authorities, it is probable he alluded to some carelessness about herself on *this* occasion, especially as in the very next letter he writes, "Here is no small expectation whether the Duke shall die or continue prisoner. I know not how to write, for I am here in my chamber [he had been many days ill] subject to reports which are contrariwise, Mather and Berny besides that they intended to kill me, have now *plainly confessed* their intention and desire to have been rid of the Queen's Majesty."

insinuations of all their marginal interpretations of public papers and intercepted letters, and we do not hesitate to pronounce them to be in general over-charged, if not absolutely false. The case of Mary Queen of Scots was one of extreme difficulty to Elizabeth; the only way to shew mercy, was to release her from restraint,\* but the bad use she might make of her liberty, even to the Queen's own *deposition* and *destruction*,† could not but excite the attention, and engage the thoughts of all her Counsellors, and indeed of all her faithful subjects: for on *her* life and safety depended the hopes of all the friends of the Reformation, and in fact the existing constitution and government in Church and State. Surely these were very creditable and honourable feelings, in whatsoever breast they were found to exist, and yet the following very harsh comments appear upon a passage in a paper, supposed to be written and published by Lord Burghley in the course of this year: speaking of the notorious conspiracies lately brought to light, the paper proceeds: “ And God send her Majesty so to remove the grounds of her peril [that is, says the commentator, to murder Queen Mary and the Duke of Norfolk], that not only we, which, by open thrusting ourselves against her enemies, have set up our rest upon our Queen Elizabeth, and shall never be admitted to favour on the other side, but also all wise and

\* How difficult it was for Elizabeth to know how to act with regard to Mary, may be judged from a letter Walsingham wrote to Lord Burghley, in which he told the latter, that the French were encouraged to think her case *not desperate*, because they heard that she *went a hawking* with Lord Shrewsbury.—*Digges*, 174.

† The discovery of Lord Seaton's negotiations with the Duke of Alva, (for which see Camden, anno 1570, p. 142.) was quite sufficient to open the eyes of Elizabeth's Council, as to the preparations making against her *with Mary's knowledge and consent*. That Lord, calling himself her Ambassador, had been with the Duke of Alva to procure his support to the Queen's party in Scotland, and get possession of the person of the *young King*. A storm on his passage drove the vessel he was in to Harwich, whence he escaped in disguise, and found his way to Scotland; but leaving his papers behind, it was discovered that the object of his journey was to encourage those of the Queen's party who had possession of the Castle of Edinburgh to hold out, upon the hope of speedy succours from abroad; and indeed his arrival in Scotland, had the effect of breaking off a negotiation then on foot with the Regent. One piece of revenge Elizabeth seems to have taken, according to Camden, namely, that, upon a complaint of the Duc d'Alva that she encouraged the Flemish rebels, by admitting them into her ports, she dismissed them in such a manner, that, under the command of Vandermark, they managed to escape with their ships, and seizing upon the Brill at the mouth of the Maese, drew other towns to the obedience of the Prince of Orange, and excluded the Duke of Alva from almost the whole command of the sea: and this is accounted the beginning of the war which separated Holland from the Spanish dominion.

honest men may know, that it shall be safe to be true, and dangerous to be false." [This, says the same commentator, is the common case of those who are totally immersed in villany; they must still proceed to greater and worse crimes, for their own safety, and to preserve their posts and pensions.] Surely any candid reader will admit, that in the struggle on foot at *this* time, in which Elizabeth and England stood opposed to *Spain, Rome, all Mary's party in Scotland, at home, in France, and the Netherlands*, there were greater changes to be apprehended than the mere loss of posts and pensions (dangerous posts and often most inadequate pensions), and that in cases of manifest treason and conspiracy, absolute murder was not the only means to be looked to of removing the grounds of peril. Of such comments we may well say *ab uno disce omnes*, for they are all in the same strain.

Most certain it is, that if a disposition had not been wanting in Elizabeth, to *rid herself speedily* of her most *dangerous* opponent and rival, she might now have been supported by a very strong party in Parliament, who strenuously sought to remove all objections, to the bringing Mary at this time to condign punishment, by a judicial process. The promoters of this severe measure, were chiefly indeed of the sect of Puritans, who were so much opposed to Popery, and all chances of its re-establishment in England or Scotland, as to allow of no alternative short of that of rooting out all semblances of so corrupt a religion, and removing all its *abettors*, as the fautors of *idolatry*.

The Committee of the two Houses, appointed to consult and deliberate upon matters concerning the Queen of Scots, consisted of twenty-one of the Upper House (whereof Lord Burghley was one), and forty-four of the Lower House. The conferences holden upon this subject terminated in their presenting to her Majesty, a paper of "reasons to prove the Queen's Majesty bound in conscience to proceed with severity in this case of the late Queen of Scots."—The paper may be seen at length in D'Ewes' Compleat Journal. The reasons are in number SIX, all fortified by passages drawn from Scripture, tending to shew, the hazards incurred by any supreme magistrate, in neglecting to punish, to the utmost extremity, certain offenders against God, or the weal of the people committed to his charge; accompanied with statements to prove, how, in every particular, the Queen of Scots had been such an offender. It is not a paper to be read in these days with any degree of satisfaction, much less pleasure; and we would willingly have hoped that it was drawn up more for the preservation of the Queen's person against *further plots and conspiracies*, by warning Mary



in time of the sense of the nation with regard to such offences, and the hazards she would incur by such intrigues, if they should be *repeated*, than immediately to be carried into execution. But the tenor of it is certainly otherwise;\* it is followed also by another paper, purporting to be “an argument persuading that the Queen’s Majesty ought to have in conscience a great care of the safety of her own person;” in which the same rules for proceeding against offenders are insisted upon.

An humble petition also was drawn up to her Majesty, with “reasons gathered out of the *civil law*, † by certain appointed by authority in Parliament to prove that it standeth not only with justice, but also with the Queen’s Majesty’s honour and safety to proceed criminally against the pretended Scottish Queen.”

In this petition the avowed object seems to have been to over-rule the Queen’s own intentions of proceeding less rigorously with Mary, such as to have her only disabled by statute, “as a person not capable of princely honour, if she should attempt any evil hereafter;” to which comparatively mild measure, objections were taken, upon the ground, that no disabling law, and in fact no laws enacted in this realm, would have any force with her, “*that is fully minded to take her advantage upon any apt occasion offered.*”

But as the whole course of these proceedings is to be seen in other books, we need not dwell on them longer than to observe, that though a bill was passed against the Queen of Scots, declaring her to be unable and unworthy to succeed to the English crown, and the Queen commended the Parliament for the care it was disposed to take of her person, yet the Houses were informed, “that her Highness, for certain respects by herself conceived, thinketh good for this time

\* Collier is very severe upon this paper, and rightly enough observes, that upon such points, there is no arguing from the Old Testament to the New. He attributes the severity of it almost entirely to the Puritans, and though some passages seem to shew that it was drawn up by a Bishop, he conceives this might have been but a piece of art, to make it pass the better. He is very severe also upon Knox, who died this year, for entertaining the same opinion, in which he says, he was encouraged and commanded by Calvin; ii. 539.—Of Collier’s enmity against the Puritans enough is known, to require any further remark at present; but that the Puritans went too far, in their resentments against the *Papists* at this time, there can be no doubt.

† These reasons may deserve more attention than the former, since we know the end of Mary, and the difficulties that stand in the way of all attempts to reconcile the proceedings against her, not only with common justice, as some insist, but with the known principles of the civil law; considering her rank, the circumstances under which she came into England, and the competency of Elizabeth to bring her to trial.

to defer, but not to reject that course of proceeding as yet."—The Bill therefore might seem at this time, to have been enacted in *terrorem*,\* were it not that some, as has been observed before, proved that they were quite in earnest, by the reproaches cast on the Queen, in the next session three years afterwards, for not having acted up to the very spirit of their former proceedings; observing, that it was to be looked upon as a judgment of God upon the Queen, that "he had (as at this time, viz. 1572) put into her heart to refuse good and wholesome laws for her *own preservation*, which caused many faithful hearts for grief to burst out with sorrowful tears; and moved all papists, traitors, &c. who envy good Christian Princes, to laugh (in their sleeves) all the whole Parliament House to scorn."—Such were the words of Wentworth in 1575, evidently looking back to the Queen's declining to take advantage of what passed this year, relative to Mary, and "*for her own preservation.*"

It is extremely evident therefore, that there were at this time some much more bent upon inflicting that severe punishment upon Mary, which afterwards befel her, than Elizabeth herself;† and though the restraint upon her person for fourteen long years afterwards, may seem to many even a more cruel punishment than an earlier death, yet so long (it seems almost impossible to deny) Elizabeth continued to bear up against the dangers that threatened her, without making that sacrifice of the unhappy but imprudent Queen of Scots, which some would have urged upon her.‡—By whom she was swayed to *defer* acting upon this bill, or upon the advice of her Parliament, we cannot pretend particularly to say.

\* "The Scottish Queen," says Lord Burghley, in a letter to Walsingham, June 6, 1572, four days only after the execution of the Duke of Norfolk, "shall be touched with an act of Parliament, but it will not draw her into any more fear to offend than words will do."

† Lord Burghley seems certainly to have been one of those who thought the Queen at this time overlooked her own great danger.—See *Strype's Annals*, vol. ii. ch. xv. His letters to Walsingham indeed plainly shew it, and as to Walsingham himself, in June of this year, he plainly avowed to Lord Burghley his opinion, that as long as Mary lived there would "never grow good accord in Scotland, nor continuance of repose in England, nor perfect and sound amity between her Majesty and France."—*Digges*, 216. In Mr. Turner's recent history of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, her Majesty is not the only person blamed for not being sufficiently on her guard, but Lord Burghley himself is judged to have been scarcely *acute* enough to penetrate the designs against her, nor even Walsingham.

‡ May 21, 1572, Leicester writes to Walsingham, in France, "Our news is, we are presently in hand to attain the Scottish Queen of treason, and yet we fear our Queen will scant agree to it."—*Digges*, 203.

The following passage in the Queen's instructions to the Earl of Lincoln, Ambassador to France, to receive the French King's ratification of the league of amity, deserves some notice.—“And howsoever the Queen Majesty hath used notable clemency and remissness towards her [Queen of Scots], in not using such revenge hereof as she well might, and she thinketh no other Prince would in like case forbear, yet the said Lord Admiral shall shew to the King with great earnestness her estates now assembled in Parliament, have and do solicit her Majesty, both in respect of her Majesty and the whole realm, to proceed against the Scottish Queen by order of justice, for her attempts against her Majesty's person, and the state of the realm, wherein her Majesty is so perplexed, with the incessant clamour and request of her people in this behalf, as indeed she is marvellously therewith troubled; for as of her own nature her Majesty has been always found even in her most private causes, and where her person has been in danger, not given to shew any vehemency or to pursue avenge, so to refuse the universal motion, the general advice and exhortation of her states, she thinketh it so small hazard of their love, which they bear to her, and what may happen hereof, the Lord Admiral may say is doubtful.”—This document, which is signed at the foot by Lord *Burghley*, deserves great attention as far as regards the Queen of Scots, especially towards the conclusion, where the following instructions to the Ambassador, relative to the House of *Guise*, must be supposed to refer to facts, known to that family: “And for the House of *Guise*, the Lord Admiral shall not forbear to salute them of his own part, according to their degrees, if he shall see that they give such countenance to him as to accept it, and if any of them shall motion matters to him, as of the Queen of Scots, he may say, if she had been counselled by her friends to have been grateful to her Majesty, or to have forborne the seeking to offend her Majesty, she might thereby have done herself good, and been the cause of quietness to the country; but she has so manifestly taken other courses, as surely either her friends that evil counselled her, or herself, must be accounted the principal cause of her trouble, and so he shall use his speech of her.”—*Digges*, 211.

As some may be disposed to question the gratitude due from Mary to Elizabeth, it may be added, that in the proceedings of the Parliament, the Queen has credit given her, for having, by her interposition, “saved Mary within her own realm from execution of death, for her most horrible and unnatural doings there, known throughout Europe to her perpetual shame and infamy for ever.”—The expressions are certainly very harsh and strong, but the fact of her



having been saved by Elizabeth's authority, is likely enough to be true, considering the indignation expressed in Scotland, by the populace, men and *women*, [See Throckmorton's dispatches,] and by the clergy, with Knox at their head.

In a communication with the French King, Elizabeth about this time, appears to have cited many curious precedents, for what had taken place with regard to Mary of Scotland. "That sons should be admitted to the government, their mothers being excluded, is no new thing. So were *Henry II.* King of England, *Alphonsus* the son of *Uraca* King of *Castile*, and lately within our memory *Charles V.* King of *Spain* and *Sicily*, admitted to the government, during the lives of their mothers. That Queens also have been imprisoned every age affords instances: and France itself may abundantly testify as much, which has seen the wives of three Kings successively, *Lewis Hutin*, *Philip le Long*, and *Charles the Fair* imprisoned, to say no worse. To speak the truth, I for my part do detain the Queen of *Scots* in honourable custody, for the safety of England, and mine own security; and for it I have examples of the French, who shut up *Chilperic* in a monastery, *Charles of Lorraine* in a deep dungeon, and *Lodovic Sforza* Duke of *Milan* in an iron grate, to secure their estates. Other like instances," says Camden, "she produced out of the *Spanish* history, as she was excellently well seen in the histories of all nations. Finally, she concluded, that such great examples as these do always carry with them some kind of injustice."

That some example was necessary to be made, in a case of such deep and complicated conspiracy and treason, as had now been brought to light, there could be little doubt; and after his conviction, the Duke of Norfolk could entertain no reasonable hope of escaping. The Queen, however, appeared reluctant to hasten his execution, and stayed it very unexpectedly, when it was fully appointed to have taken place.—Of this Lord Burghley gave the following account in a letter to Sir Francis Walsingham, dated 11th February, 1571-2. "I cannot tell you what is the inward cause of the stay of the Duke of Norfolk's death, only I find her Majesty diversely disposed, sometime when she speaketh of her danger, she concludeth that justice should be done; at another time when she speaketh of his nearness of blood, of his superiority in honour, &c.: she stayeth. As upon Saturday she signed a warrant for the writs to the Sheriffs of London for his execution of Monday, and so all preparations were made with the expectation of all London, and concourse of many thousands in the morning; but their coming was answered with another ordinary execution of *Mather* and *Berny*, for conspiring the Queen's Majesty's death, and of one Ralph for

counterfeiting the Queen's Majesty's hand twice, to get concealed lands, and the cause of this disappointment was this; suddenly on Sunday, late in the night, the Queen's Majesty sent for me, and entered into a great misliking that the Duke should die the next day, and said she was and should be disquieted, and said she would have a new warrant made that night to the Sheriffs, to forbear untill they should hear further; and so they did. God's will be fulfilled, and aid her Majesty to do herself good."\*

At length on the 2d of June, five months after he was condemned, the sentence of the law was suffered to take place, and the Duke paid the forfeit of his great imprudences on Tower-hill. On the scaffold he addressed the crowd assembled below him, not without interruption from the Sheriffs and other public officers in attendance. What he really spake, Strype has preserved in his Appendix† to the 2d volume of his Annals, taken from a MS. in the Cotton Library; Hollinshead had given a larger account, but not so correct; and Camden, who was present at the execution, has only reported as much as he could recollect.—On the day after the execution, Lord Burghley had occasion to wait upon the Queen, to communicate letters he had received from Sir Francis Walsingham, in which mention was made both of the Duke and the Queen of Scots; but he found her so sorrowful about the former, that in his conference with her, he was, as he tells Walsingham, obliged to turn from the dead to the living, and confine what he had to say, exclusively to the Queen of Scots.‡

The Duke, no doubt, died very generally regretted, for he had some excellent qualities,§ but by allowing himself to be drawn too far into the vortex of the

\* Elizabeth was so ungenerous as to cast the blame of his *execution* upon Lord Burghley; but *the necessity* of this sad measure was too apparent to be overlooked by others, besides Lord Burghley, and can, we should think, be scarcely overlooked at this day, by whomsoever the danger of the alternative to Elizabeth shall be properly weighed; nor indeed had the Duke such claims upon Cecil's friendship as some have pretended, since he had very much given himself up to Leicester, and was to the last probably a tool in the hands of the Catholics, whose aim seems to have been to get rid of Cecil, before their plan was ripe.—See Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary, art. *Cecil*.

† No. xiii.

‡ Digges, 212.

§ "He was a noble man," says the author of *Memoirs of William Cecil Lord Burleigh*, every way amiable, for he was learned, generous, pious, brave, and naturally inclined to every thing good." The same author represents him, as having caused his own destruction, an observes, that on his first discharge, Cecil gave him such advice, as would have overthrown all the schemes of his pretended friends but real enemies; he told him plainly, says he, that liberty might be more fatal to him than confinement, and that as an intended marriage was the cause of

conspiracy for which he suffered, his best friends were obliged to make a sacrifice of their friendship to their loyalty, as was the case very particularly with Sir Roger Manners (of the right noble family of the Earls of Rutland), who being suspected by the Queen, in consequence of his known intimacy with the Duke, wrote to Lord *Burghley*, to beg he would represent him to her Majesty, as one of as sound religion and unspotted loyalty as ever, professing his great love for the Duke, till his sad fall: "Since which time," so he expressed himself, "I am sure no man ever heard me any way excuse any part of his faults; for surely, my Lord, I never meant to love any man longer than I thought he loved the Queen's Majesty." And this probably was the case with many. Cecil's own words are much to the same effect, "Of all subjects I honoured and loved him above the rest, and surely found in him always matter so deserving."—*Letter to Sir Henry Norris*. Some however could not be so restrained, and great attempts were made to rescue the Duke, which could not but receive encouragement from the Queen's delay of his execution, which made those who really wished her well, desirous of having the sentence executed, that men's minds might become more quiet.\*

The league with France having been concluded by Sir Thomas Smith and Sir Francis Walsingham, the Earl of Lincoln (Lord Admiral) was sent to Paris† by the Queen, to receive in form the oath and ratification of the French King, and for the same purpose Montmorency was, on the part of the Court of France, dispatched to England. Both embassies were very splendid, and the two Courts seemed to vie in giving honour to their respective Ministers. Lord Lincoln wrote a long account to Lord Burghley of his reception in France, assuring him, "that as great entertainment and honour had been done him, in respect of her Majesty, as he ever had seen, and all at the King's charges."‡

his misfortunes, so a proper marriage would be an easy and speedy cure of them. Had the Duke followed this advice indeed he might have saved his life."—See also *Camden*, 148.

\* The Duke was the first Nobleman beheaded in this reign. *Carte* tells us the Queen revoked no fewer than four warrants for his execution, but so little credit is he disposed to give Elizabeth for any amiable feelings, that he thinks she was only seeking to procure addresses to sanction her severity.

† See before;—the treaty may be found in *Camden*, 185.

‡ His account of the sumptuous entertainments given at Paris by the royal family may be seen in *Nichols*, i. 302, taken from the Lord Admiral's letter to Lord *Burghley*; how admirably Charles IX. acted his part upon this as upon former occasions, the following passage may serve to shew: "When the King had heard his Even-song, we were sent for by the Prince Dolphin to the King, and there at his high altar he took his oath, and afore he did swear, he told me openly that there was nothing that ever contented him better than this league, between the Queen his good sister



It was on the 9th of June that the French Ambassador, the Duke of Montmorency, chief Marshal of France, reached Dover, with a large retinue, and on the 14th arrived at Somerset House, in London;\* whence taking his barge, with other barges attending upon him, he was conducted to the Court by the Earl of Sussex and the Lord Norris, and most graciously received by the Queen and her Nobles. Guards were appointed to attend upon him, and no expense spared in doing honour to his embassy; of the shows, pastimes, tilts, and tournaments provided for his entertainment, accounts may be seen in other books. It appertains more to the history we are writing, to notice the Feast of St. George, which was holden at Windsor on the 18th of June, this year, for the purpose of conferring the Order of the Garter on the Duke, who was on that day installed a Knight, and he, and the Nobles his companions, most royally feasted. Upon this occasion, the Ambassador was, in great form, accompanied from London by the Earls of Bedford, Leicester, and Essex, the Lords Grey de Wilton, Sandys, BURGHLEY, and others; receiving in gifts from her Majesty, besides many pieces of plate, a Garter of gold with diamonds and rubies, a George and diamonds, a Collar of gold, and another George less ornamented;—on the 28th the embassy returned to France. †

It was at this time, that in consideration of his great diligence and fidelity, her Majesty conferred the Order of the Garter also on Lord Burghley himself; the

and him, being so noble and worthy a Princess as she is, and as he did publicly take the oath according to the order in such cases, so did he, perchance that he did it from his heart, as the thing that he would truly and justly observe and keep during his life, with such a show of contentation as I have not seen the like."

\* In Lord Burghley's Diary in *Murdin* this occurs under June 15.

† The French Court took occasion by this embassy to make another proposition of marriage to Elizabeth. The projected match with the King's next brother, the Duc d'Anjou having failed, Catherine de Medicis proposed her *youngest* son, the Duc d'Alençon as a proper match for the Queen, which certainly in point of age he was *not*, being at the least 22 years younger than her Majesty. Elizabeth took a month to consider of it, during which she kept all around her in the usual state of uncertainty. In the mean while, Lord Burghley made many inquiries about him which Walsingham answered.—See *Digges*, 218, 220. But in the month of August an interruption took place in the harmony of the two Courts, which put aside for the time all thoughts of such an union; and possibly the Court of France was only making it a cover to its perfidious intentions towards the Protestants. *Strype's Annals*, ii. 218, and his *Life of Smith*, ch. xiii. But we shall see this negotiation renewed: *Rapin* by mistake has said that the French Ambassador sought to bring on *again* the marriage with the Duc d'Anjou, but it was the Duc d'Alençon who was now proposed, though he also became Duc d'Anjou, on Henry's accession to the throne.

Chancellorship of the Order, which he had formerly held, having been in April bestowed on his great friend Sir Thomas Smith, who now also appears to have obtained the vacant Secretaryship, though the precise date of his appointment is rather obscure.—See Strype's Life of Smith, ch. xiii. In July following, as we have before noted, Lord Burghley was farther advanced to be Lord High Treasurer, in which post he continued till his death. This appointment brought with it, as we are told by his Domestic, a new accession of cares and an additional load of business; in common justice to his Lordship we cannot refrain from copying what this attached attendant says of him at this period, speaking of his appointment to be Lord Treasurer, he says, "which place he honoured, as much as the place honoured him, therein exercising his wisdom and temper in so good sort, as shewed his truth to his Sovereign, and careful administration of justice to her subjects; justice and peace kissing each other. He grew now to some greatness; carrying a reputation to bear such sway and rule in the commonwealth and state, as it was thought nothing was done without him, and no wonder, for his justice with his integrity, and temper with his justice so concurred, as well were they satisfied who could bring their cause to his hearing to be tried before him. He so equally hearing, justly censuring, and carefully dispatching causes, as few suits were suffered to linger long before him, but were either ended by judgment or ordered by agreement.

"His Lordship used one singular course in hearing causes; viz. that if he found them difficult, or deserving rigorously to be censured, he would ever make motions for arbitrament, and either by his authority or persuasion agree them, so as he ended more causes in a term, than were before ended in a twelvemonth; insomuch that all men had such an opinion of his justice and indifference, as they never thought themselves satisfied, nor their suits well ended, that either had not their cause brought to his hearing, or his letter in their behalf.

"Which drew upon him such a multitude of suits as was incredible, but to us that saw it; for besides all business in Council, or other weighty causes, and such as were answered by word of mouth, there was not a day in a term wherein he received not threescore, fourscore, or an hundred petitions, which he commonly read at night, and gave every man answer the next morning, as he went to the hall; wherein one notable thing was observed of his excellent memory, viz. that reading those bills over night, there was not one petitioner came to him for answer of his petition the next morning, but, so soon as they told but their names, or what countrymen they were, he would presently

remember it, tell them the matter, and give them his answer ; which was a sign of a memorable memory, among so many other great causes, to hold in mind so many other several suits.

“ But, as his memory was excellent, his pains and industry were incessant, and the one mutually assisting the other, brought him to that perfection. He used also to answer the poorest soul by word of mouth, appointing times and places of purpose so long as he was able.

“ But after he grew impotent and weak, and could not go abroad, as his nature was ever to do good, he neglected no means to perform it. For then he devised a new way that others may imitate, viz. that being by age and infirmities (we must anticipate here a little), forced to keep his chamber, and sometimes his bed, he took order that poor suitors should send in their petitions sealed up ; whereby the poorest man’s bill came to him as soon as the richest.

“ Upon every petition he caused his answer to be written on the back side, and subscribed it with his own name ; or else they had his letter, or other answer, as the cause required ; by which charitable and honourable device, there was none staid for an answer, but was speedily dispatched, and as many or more suits were answered, as when he went abroad.

“ Thus held he on his course like himself, prayed for by the poor, honoured of the rich, feared of the bad, and loved of the good ; to his Prince and country loyal, and to the subjects most pleasing. For wondering at his great wisdom and gravity, and praising his justice and integrity, most men honoured him with the title of Father of the Commonwealth.

“ Whereof they saw him as tender and careful as of his own child ; shewing his care of the service of the state to be such, as I can truly witness he never respected pleasure nor profit, wealth nor health, friends nor foes, nor any thing private : neglecting and rejecting them all, when there was any service of his Prince, or causes of his country to be followed or performed. Wherein his labour and care was so incessant, and his study so great, as in cases of necessity, he cared for neither meat, sleep, or rest, till his business was brought to some end ; and when he was in never so great pain or sickly, if he could but be carried abroad, he would go to dispatch business, though it were with never so great pain or danger.

“ His industry, in times of necessity, being thus very great, and his diligent and studious course of life continually no less, caused all his friends to pity him, and his very servants to admire him.



“ And myself, as an eye-witness, can testify, that I never saw him half an hour idle, in four and twenty years together.

“ For if there were cause of business, he was occupied till that was done; which commonly was not long in hand.

“ If he had no business (which was very seldom), he was reading or *collecting*.\*

“ If he rid abroad, he heard suitors; when he came in, he dispatched them.†

“ When he went to bed and slept not, he was either meditating or reading; and I have heard him say, he did penetrate further into the depths of causes, and found out more resolution [of dubious points] in his bed, than when he was up. Indeed, he left himself scarce time for sleep, or meals, or leisure to go to bed; yet so long as his business went forward, and his Prince and country were pleased, he thought his pains a pleasure, and all he could do too little—so great was his care and love to his Prince and country.”

Those who are at all conversant with the contents of our national repositories of manuscripts, and the incalculable amount of papers (letters, addresses, petitions, &c. &c.) known, by his own indorsement and other particulars, to have undoubtedly passed through the hands of Lord Burghley, most of them indeed being immediately addressed to him; so far from regarding the above as any exaggerated account of his immense labours, will rather, we think, be glad to be supplied with it, as a piece of information almost necessary to account for the

\* Among some papers obligingly put aside for my inspection by Mr. Lemon, of the State Paper Office, there is a large *collection of pedigrees* of the Kings of Judah, Israel, Macedonia, Egypt; of the Kings of Assyria, Chaldea, Medes and Persians; of the Maccabees and Herodian families, all in Lord Burghley's own hand-writing, and marked by him, *Collecta ex Historiis sacr. trib. Regum Jerusalem, &c.*—a strong proof of the curious subjects to which he was accustomed to apply his mind, in the very few hours of leisure he could ever command; for even illness did not relieve him from the burthen of public business, as might be proved in a thousand instances. Among the very papers alluded to, there is an interesting letter to him from the celebrated Dr. Lawrence Humfrey, of Oxford, which begins, “ Et molestum mihi est flagitatorum videri, et gravi est eadem de re scribere, ad occupatissimum præsertim, maxime ad te Cæcili ornatissime, quem in eo gradu divina Providentia locavit, ut non modo ab intimis consiliis Reg. Majties. sed à secratis omnium fere homuncionum esse videaris, &c. &c.” with much more to the same effect.

† “ At night, when he put off his gown, he used to say, ‘ Lye there, Lord Treasurer;’ and bidding adieu to all state affairs, dispose himself to his quiet rest.”—*Fuller's Holy State*, p. 27. The same author supplies us with another anecdote. “ The Queen reflected her favours highly upon him; counting him both her Treasurer and her principal Treasure. She would cause him always to sit in her presence, because troubled with the gout; and used to tell him, My Lord, we make much of you, not for your bad legs, but for your good head.”—P. *ib.*

magnitude of such collections, mostly derived from the archives of the great Lord Treasurer, being, as it were, the official remains of that celebrated servant of the public, from his first appointment of Master of the Requests, under Edward, to the end of his anxious and laborious career, towards the close of the long reign of Elizabeth; so that it has been well said, by the author of his life, in the *Biographia Britannica*, “If we should particularly take notice of all the great transactions in which he had the principal share, this article would swell into a history.”

But to return to the state of public affairs. It was on St. Bartholomew's day this year, August 24, that the memorable slaughter of the French Protestants took place, commonly known by the name of the massacre of *Paris*.<sup>\*</sup> A more sanguinary and atrocious act it would be impossible to conceive, let the motives alleged for its perpetration be what they might: we mean, whether they were strictly of a religious nature, or as the French Court would have insisted, political; and to ward off or prevent projected treasons and conspiracies against the Royal Family.<sup>†</sup> It would be beyond our purpose to go far into the details of this horrible transaction, especially as there is no want of historians to consult upon the occasion. Nothing could exceed the consternation it excited in England, though the French Ambassador here was speedily instructed so to explain matters, as to save, if possible, his master's honour, by pretending, as had already been tried with Walsingham at Paris, that the *Royal Family* had been in danger from the designs of the *Protestants*, and of the party attached to the Admiral *Coligni*, whose horrible and disgustingly cruel murder was the forerunner of all the atrocities that followed.

Strype has introduced, from a *French* historian, the following account of what passed in the metropolis:—“The palace clock struck; then a noise was heard about the streets of Paris that the Hugonots were in arms (they being in

\* Not that the massacre was confined to the metropolis; for as Walsingham wrote home, great cruelties were committed at *Lyons*, *Bordeaux*, and *Orleans*.—Other places might be added. See *Ellis's Original Letters*, 2d Series, vol. iii. 23.

† *Strype's Annals*, ii. b. i. ch. 17. so represented by Charles IX. and the Queen Mother to Walsingham, and a few days after it happened. The English Minister was spared, and his house suffered to be a sort of sanctuary to many persons: amongst those who took shelter there, was the famous Sir Philip Sidney, who happened to be at Paris at the time, and in such favour (possibly a treacherous attention) with Charles IX. as to have been appointed a Gentleman of his Chamber.—See *Quarterly Review*, No. i. 81.

their beds), and meant to kill the King, &c. The gentlemen, officers of the chamber, governors, tutors, and household servants of the King of Navarre and Prince of Condé, were driven out of their chambers where they slept in the Louvre, and, being in the court, massacred in the King's presence. The like was done to the lords and gentlemen that lay about the Admiral's lodgings; and then throughout the town, in such sort, that the number slain that Sunday night, and the two days ensuing, within the city of Paris and the suburbs, was esteemed to be about 10,000 persons; lords, gentlemen, pages, servants, and of all sorts; justices, scholars, lawyers, physicians, merchants, artificers, women, maids, boys; not sparing little children in their cradles, nor in their mother's bellies."

The Admiral's head was carried and presented to the King and to the Queen Mother, and then embalmed and sent to Rome, to the Pope, and the Cardinal of Lorrain. The common people cut off his hands, &c. and drew his body for the space of three days about the city, which done, it was borne to the gibbet of Montfaucon, and there hanged by the feet.\*

We are not willing to enlarge much upon this horrible event, but since it could not fail to have a great influence on the general affairs of Europe, and as it has been conjectured that Lord Burghley was meant to be included in the massacre, it seems to belong to our subject, and we shall therefore add one more passage selected by Strype, from the same French historian. "Let the reader consider how strange and horrible a thing it was in a great town, to see at least 60,000 men with pistols, pikes, cutlasses, poniards, knives, and other such bloody instruments, run, swearing and blaspheming the sacred majesty of God, through the streets and into the houses; where most cruelly they massacred all whosoever they met, without regard of estate, condition, sex, or age. The streets paved with bodies cut and hewed to pieces; the gates and entries of houses, palaces, and public places, dyed with blood; shoutings and halloosings of the murderers, mixed with continual noises of pistols and calivers discharged; the pitiful cries and shrieks of those that were murdered; slain bodies cast out at windows upon the stones, drawn through the dirt, with strange noises and whistlings; carts, some carrying away the spoils, and others the dead bodies, which were thrown

\* Among the sufferers most basely betrayed, and most cruelly used, was the celebrated Peter Ramus (or la Ramée), who had done so much to shake the credit of Aristotle; and who, after being under the protection of the Cardinal of Lorrain, had turned Calvinist.—See *Art. Ramus, Dict. Historique*, and *Zouch's Life of Sir Philip Sidney*, 43.



into the river of Seine, all now red with blood, which ran out of the town and from the King's own palace."

Voltaire, who certainly meant to speak only of what he knew to be the truth, in his *Essay on the Civil Wars of France*, states, after other historians, that "*Tavannes, Marechal* of France, an ignorant and superstitious soldier, who joined the fury of religion to the rage of party, rode on horseback through Paris, crying to his soldiers, Let blood, let blood; bleeding is wholesome in the month of August as well as in May."

We have an excellent account in Digges's *Compleat Ambassador*, of the first intelligence received by the English Court of this shocking transaction, in a minute to Sir Francis Walsingham, signed by Lord Burghley, Lord Leicester, Sir Francis Knollys, Sir Thomas Smith, and Sir James Croft; in which, while great care is taken to preserve the subsisting amity between the two Courts, *if possible*, by pretending to give credit to the French Ambassador's explanation of matters, yet, it is added, that the same Ambassador had been informed that *appearances* were, by many circumstances, as things stood, *against the King*; that her Majesty did greatly lament the deaths of those who had fallen, and that "if the King shall not use his power to make some amends for so much blood so horribly shed, God, who seeth the hearts of all, as well Princes as others, will shew his justice in time and place, when his honour shall therein be glorified, as the author of all justice, and the revenger of all blood-shedding of the innocents."\*

But the following private letter from Lord *Burghley* to Sir Francis, ten days afterwards, more unreservedly expresses the sentiments of that great man upon the sad occasion:—

"Sir,—I see the Devil is suffered, by the Almighty God, for our sins, to be strong in following the persecution of Christ's members; and therefore we are not only vigilant of our own defence against such traitorous attempts as lately

\* So far was this infatuated Monarch from making amends for the innocent blood shed in the general massacre, that he had two Gentlemen executed, under a pretended conviction and acknowledgment of their having been privy to the alleged conspiracy against the King. They made them, just before they were executed, sign two blank papers, which Charles caused to be filled up afterwards, so as to imply that they knew of the pretended conspiracy. The King and Queen Mother witnessed the execution, and caused others, against their will, to attend.—See *Strype*, and the article *Briquemaut et Cavagnes*, in the *Dictionnaire Historique*. Even Henry of Navarre is particularly mentioned as an unwilling spectator of the horrid sight.

have been put in use there in France, but also to call ourselves to repentance. Of the Queen's Majesty's answer to this Ambassador, I have at good length comprized the same in writing, which cometh now unto you signed by the Council, which you shall use according as the time shall teach you. For although the Ambassador hath seemed to gain so much credit with her Majesty, as she thinketh the King is not guilty of the murders, otherwise than he reporteth; and further, that although the Ambassador saith that the King willed him to assure her Majesty that the navy prepared by *Strozzi*, should not any ways endamage her Majesty, we have great cause, in *these* times, to *doubt all fair speeches*; and, therefore, we do presently put all the sea-coasts in defence, and mean to send the Queen's Majesty's navy to the sea with speed, and so to continue, until we see further whereunto to trust.—I desire to have knowledge of as many of the principals as were slain, and what Protestants did escape."

Lord Leicester wrote less temperately, but his sincerity upon all points is so questionable, that we cannot much trust to the indignation he expresses against this or any other wicked deed: his words, however, are very strong, and his resentment, upon such a cause as this, is not reasonably to be questioned.

"If that King be author and doer of this act, shame and confusion light upon him, be he never so strong in the sight of men, the Lord hath not his power for nought. If he continue in confirming the fact, and allowing the persons that did it, then must he be a Prince to be detested of all honest men, whatsoever religion they have; for as this fact was ugly, so was it inhuman, for whom should a man trust, if not his Prince's word? and these men whom he has put to slaughter, not only had his word, but his writing, and not public, but private, with open proclamations, and all other manner of declarations that could be devised for their safety, which now being violated and broken, who can believe or trust him?" He expresses his hope, however, that the Ambassador's exposition of matters may prove true, and ends with requesting Sir Francis to be a mean for procuring his nephew's (Philip Sidney) speedy and safe return.

Sir Thomas Smith also\* wrote in very mournful but indignant terms upon the occasion, ending his letter with saying, "It grieveth no man in England so much as me; and indeed I have, in some respects, the greatest cause;" meaning probably in having been so duped by the French Court, and an instrument in

\* See Strype's *Life of Smith*, and his *Annals*, ch. xviii. vol. ii.

concluding the treacherous peace so lately settled. He speaks of the events that had taken place at Paris, as of treasons and cruelties more barbarous than ever the Scythians used, and *ironically* adds, "I am most sorry for the King whom I love, whom I esteem the most *worthy*, the most *faithful* Prince of the world, the most *sincere* monarch now living."

But the most curious letter upon the subject of all, perhaps, is the following from Lord Burghley to Walsingham, dated from Reading, September 25, 1572.

"Sir,—The last letters of yours by me received, were those which young Mr. Hopton brought hither, since which time we have understood, by report from *Roan*, that on Thursday was sennight there was a general slaughter made at *Roan* of all that could be *imagined* Protestants, so as the very channels of the street did run blood. We have heard diversely of *Rochel*, by some that it is sacked by *Strozzi*, by some that it holdeth out, and that it is like so to do a long time. As to the Ambassador's negotiation here with us, to seek to persuade us that the King was forced, for safety of his own life, to cause the execution to be done as it was, and that thereof we shall see the proofs by the Admiral's process, you may imagine how hard a thing it is for us to be so persuaded against all our natural senses; and how they will accord these two jars, we know not. The *King's* letter first written after the Admiral's death, doth declare it to be done by manner of sedition, and privately by the House of *Guise*, who feared the Admiral and his would pursue against them the avenge for his hurt, and the King's own guard about the Admiral was *forced*, and the King himself driven to hold his guards about him in the *Louvre* for his *own* defence; and now, yet it must needs be *notified*, that the King did, for his own surety, cause the execution to be done."\*

Another curious contradiction might be pointed out. According to the King's letter above, the blame is cast on the Guises; and yet he was willing enough afterwards to take the *honour* to himself, in a medal struck at Paris, with his own effigies on a throne, treading upon dead bodies, with this motto, *Virtus in rebelles*; and on the reverse, the arms of France, with these words, *Pietas excitavit Justitiam*. 24 Augusti, 1572.

Both Courts, however, made a show of abiding by the terms of the late treaty, but it was only show;† for Charles undoubtedly was bent upon subduing the Protestants if he could, and, indeed (in conjunction with those who had previ-

\* Compleat Ambassador, p. 264.

† See Rapin, viii. 473, 474.



ously united in a league for the very purpose), *Protestantism generally*; including of course the Church of England in its turn.\* As for Elizabeth, she was too wise not to see this, and her Council felt themselves severally so grossly deceived by the French King and Court, that it was impossible to advise her to act otherwise than upon a general principle of distrust.

In the mean while the resentment of the treacherous dealings towards those of the religion in France, was strongly manifested by the people of England; even the French Ambassador, when he next went to Court, had to pass through a company all clad in mourning, and without receiving any of the customary salutations. The Ambassador's (M. Salignae de la Motte Fenelon) own account is very striking—at his first audience after the massacre, which took place at Woodstock, “a gloomy sorrow,” he wrote, “sat on every face. Silence, as in the dead of night, reigned through all the chambers of the royal apartments: the Ladies and Courtiers were ranged on each side, all clad in deep mourning; and as I passed through, not one bestowed on me a civil look, or made the least return to my salutes.” This Ambassador, sensible of the national disgrace, declared himself ashamed to bear the name of Frenchman, and when commanded by Charles IX. to explain matters to Elizabeth, remonstrated, saying, it would be to make himself an accomplice; those who had *advised* it, should be sent on such an errand. See *Sewell's Biographiana*, cited by Zouch, in his Life of Sir Philip Sidney; and *Compleat Ambassador*, 247. And when, soon after, the French King and his mother, were for renewing the negotiations for a marriage between Elizabeth and the Duc d'Alençon, Walsingham did not fail to represent to both, according to the instructions he had received from home, that for the King to destroy and utterly root out of his realm all those of that

\* Walsingham was so persuaded of this, that he urges the Queen, in his letters, to stand on her guard, and unite herself with the Protestant German Princes; and to beware of *Mary*, and trust none of her fair speeches, having had so late experience of her faithless dealing. This Minister seems to have been perfectly persuaded, after he had been brought to a sense of the extreme duplicity and dissimulation of the French Court, that Elizabeth was in danger from all quarters, and could have no hope of keeping the crown on her head, but by preparing for her defence in every way possible.

Smith, wisely enough alluding to the rules of diplomacy, under the most suspicious circumstances, says, “Yet *Princes*, you know, are acquainted with nothing but *douceur*, so must be handled with *douceur*;” alluding to the show of amity kept up: “not (he goes on) that they should think the Queen's Majesty, and her Council, such fools, as we know not what is to be done; and yet that we should not appear so rude and barbarous, as to provoke where no profit is to any man.”

religion which she [Elizabeth] professed, and to desire her in marriage for his brother at the same time, must needs seem to her at the first a thing very repugnant in itself; especially having before confirmed that liberty to them of that religion, by an edict of his, perpetual and irrevocable. *Catherine de Medicis* made strange proposals of meeting Elizabeth, upon the sea, to confer with her, between Dover and Calais, but the latter declined it, declaring that the murder of the Admiral, and general slaughter of the Protestants,\* had moved such doubts in her mind, that she knew not how to interpret of the offers of the marriage or of the interview; and when in October the proposal of an interview was renewed, and the Isle of Jersey fixed upon, the Lord Burghley, by word of mouth, told the French Ambassador, that it seemed to her Majesty to be so strange, both for time and place, as that if the Ambassador had not shewed the letters from the Queen there, † and the Queen Mother to that effect, she should either not have believed it, or concluded that the Ambassador had mistaken the same.‡ “Thus plainly,” adds Strype, “did Elizabeth shew her disgust and just jealousy of such invitations;” indeed the jealousy excited by such proposals, extended to the supposition that evil designs were in agitation against her Majesty’s person at this time, had she yielded to the request.§

\* “In one interview Walsingham had with Catherine de Medicis, the latter seems to have been admirably caught in her own trap. In order to abate Elizabeth’s concern for the Admiral, she told Walsingham of a paper which had been found, with his Testament, in which amongst other advices, given to the King her son, one was, to keep the Queen of England and the King of Spain as low as he could, as a thing that tended much to the safety and maintenance of his crown. To which Walsingham answered, that howsoever he might be affected to the Queen his mistress, he shewed himself therein a most true and faithful subject to the crown of France, and that the Queen’s Majesty made the more account of him, because she knew him to be so faithfully affected to the same.”—*Compleat Ambassador*, 241.

† The Queen *there*, must mean *Elizabeth*, the consort of *Charles IX.*; of this princess it is then but justice to say, that she has the reputation of being a most amiable and virtuous woman, and in no manner personally implicated in the atrocious transactions we have had to record; “La funeste nuit de la St. Barthelemi l’affligea extrêmement, elle n’en apprit, pas plutot la nouvelle à son réveil, qu’elle se jetta toute baignée de pleurs aux pieds de son crueifix, pour demander à Dieu misericorde d’une action si atroce, et qu’elle detestoit avec horreur.”—See, *Dict. Historique Elizabeth d’Autriche*.

‡ See Lord Burghley’s letter to Walsingham, *Compleat Ambassador*, 316, where he treats these proposals for an interview as a perfect mockery.

§ It was a common trick in these times to work upon the passions of the ignorant and superstitious, by casting figures of persons that should be destroyed, and dispersing prophetic intima-

Soon after this the Queen was solicited to stand godmother to the new-born daughter of Charles the IXth, and to send over either Lord Leicester or Lord BURGHLEY, to assist at the ceremony. "Perhaps," says Strype, "it was to catch one of those chief counsellors of the Queen's." Elizabeth told Charles in her answer, that "as she before had intention to have sent either one of *them*, or such other as should have been as agreeable to the thing, so now there was to all the world one great cause that she might not with honour, nor with law of nature, send any whom she loved, to be in danger, as it seemed they might be, though the King had never so good a meaning; for by the death of so many, whom the King did not avow, nor yet punished the murderers, what could strangers expect; especially when the King pretended, as by his own letters it appeared, that it was the fury of the Catholics against those of the religion." "It is very likely," Strype further observes, "that these prime counsellors of the Queen were designed to be butchered, could they by this wile have got them there." And indeed Camden is more explicit upon the subject, speaking of the marriage of the King of Navarre and the Princess Margaret. "To this marriage," says he, "were allured, by flattering promises and credulous hope of a perpetual peace and renewing of love, but with notable dissimulation, the Queen of *Navarre*, and all the choicest of the Protestants. There were also invited out of England, under pretence of doing them honour, *Leicester* and *Burghley*, and out of Germany the Elector *Palatine's* sons, that being thus brought into the net, both they, and with them the *Evangelical* religion, might with one stroke, if not have their throats cut, yet at least-wise receive a mortal wound." But to return to the proposed sponsorship. Elizabeth's answer was to this effect, that she neither desired to christen the royal infant, nor would she send either of the Lords mentioned; but that if the *Queen* (meaning, that is, *Elizabeth d'Autriche*, the Queen Consort) *should desire it*, she would not refuse, and would send some properly qualified person to represent her.

Towards the close of the year, however, a special Ambassador was dispatched from the French Court, to propose, first, a continuance of amity, secondly, that the Queen should be sponsor to the King's daughter, and thirdly, to pursue the treaty of marriage with the Duc d'Alençon. Before Elizabeth could be persuaded to entertain this embassy in a friendly manner, Charles was again

tions of their speedy fall and destruction: the enemies of Queen Elizabeth were very busy in this way, in the North especially, at this time.—See *Strype's Life of Sir Thomas Smith*; 127, *Annals*, ii. ch. xx.



reminded through his Minister, of his cruel proceedings against the Protestants, and the odd appearance it must give to his present overtures in the eyes of strangers; nor did the Queen decline giving shelter to such as were compelled to fly from France, though Charles called upon her to bid them depart her kingdom, as rebels to his crown. She replied, that “she did not know or understand of any rebellion they were privy to, and that it was the privilege of all realms to receive such woful and miserable persons, as did flee to it only for defence of their lives.” \*

The name of the Ambassador sent upon this errand was, according to Strype, *Manvesire*; Walsingham calls him *Mansiere* or *Mannesiere*, but Lord Burghley in his Diary, *Mason Fleur*.† The inattention to the spelling and writing of names in those days is quite extraordinary.

But before we proceed further with the history of this renewed negotiation for a marriage with the Duc d’Alençon, it may be proper to consider what was passing in Scotland. The Earl of Lennox, the *natural* guardian of the young King, being his grandfather, had been, as we have before shewn, advanced to the regency, not many months after the death or murder of Murray, on the 17th of July, in the year 1570; but, in the month of September, 1571, the new Regent was also slain‡ in a tumult, the particulars of which being amply related

\* Among those who came to England, in consequence of this horrible massacre, was John de Ferriers, Vidame of Chartres, a learned and worthy nobleman, Strype calls him; he had had a very narrow escape, the Duke of Guise having actually followed him home to his house to murder him, but he was able to conceal himself, and then applied for the King’s safe-guard, which was readily granted, upon a hope that he would be induced by it to return to his house, and there meet his fate; but he made use of the safe-guard to steal away to England, where he arrived on the 7th of September, and immediately wrote to the Lord Treasurer, to admonish him to arouse the Queen to a sense of her danger, and to excite her warmly to resent what had come to pass, and not be too lenient with the Papists, believing that they would become more gentle by a few light words; for that he was assured, that they would rather become more and more insolent, if they were more easily dealt with. The letter is to be seen in the Appendix to Strype’s Life of Archbishop Parker, No. lxx. The beginning has something curious in it, “*Liberato mihi ex carnificina Parisiensi et elapso è manibus Guisii qui primum ad domum usque meam est insectatus, et postea insidiis omnis generis mihi, tetendit, &c.*”

† Nov. 1572, “Mason Fleur came to Hampton Court from the Duke of Alanson.”

‡ He was slain by the orders of Lord Claud Hamilton, in revenge of the death of his relative, the Archbishop of St. Andrew’s, who had been executed by the Regent’s order not many months before.—See *McCrie’s Life of Knox*, ii. 197. Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio observes, that the person who struck the fatal blow, “prononça le nom de l’archevêque, et lui fit, sentir que cette mort

in other histories, we have not dwelt upon; and the Earl of Mar, who had exerted himself vigorously to defeat the plan of the *Queen's* friends on the late occasion, and thereby strongly recommended himself to the other party, was speedily chosen to succeed Lennox. The disturbed state of the kingdom, however, for which he has the credit of having felt most deeply, and his perfect inability to heal the wounds which others are supposed to have been interested in keeping open, had such an effect on his mind as to sink him into a deep melancholy, of which he soon died; "a martyr," as a celebrated writer calls him, "to his situation and sensibilities."\* Upon the death of this amiable, but irresolute Nobleman, the Earl of Morton was chosen to succeed him [Nov. 24, 1572], a more able, but by no means so honourable or popular a man as his predecessor. But before we proceed to notice what passed under the new government, we must observe, that on the very day that Morton became Regent, the *Kirk of Scotland* lost its celebrated founder; or, at least, its firmest and most strenuous supporter, *Knox*, in the 67th year of his age. The Regent (Morton) attended his funeral, and pronounced at his grave these memorable words: "There lies He, who never feared the face of man." Like many other public characters of those days, this eminent reformer has had the fate to be spoken of by different writers, in very opposite terms. He has met with an able biographer in our own days, Dr. McCrie, to whom we must refer the reader, for such an account as is eminently calculated to do justice to the reformer, and rescue him as well from the mistakes of Protestants, as from the reproaches of Papists. A foreign writer, who felt some displeasure at the severity of his censures from the pulpit, gives him the credit of having "immortalized himself by his courage against Popery, and his firmness against the tyranny of Mary."—Against the latter, it is well known, that he took a most decided part, to the impeachment of his *loyalty*, his *humanity*, and his *courtesy*. Dr. McCrie of course has examined all these charges, and plainly shewn, how necessary it is to go deeply into the history of the public transactions of those times, to be able duly to appreciate the part taken by certain eminent individuals engaged in them, and to judge correctly of the construction that ought to be put on many passages of their lives, obnoxious to the parties to whom, by inevitable circumstances, they were

avoit au moins autorisé les représailles si elle ne les justifioit pas entièrement aux yeux de la raison," Such severe *reprisals* were what Elizabeth and her *Protestant* Counsellors had constantly to dread, and we may add, to guard against.

\* Stuart's History of Scotland.

generally opposed. One passage from this important work we must have leave to extract. "But the greatest torrents of abuse poured upon his (Knox's) character, have proceeded from those literary champions who have come forward to avenge the wrongs, and vindicate the innocence of the peerless and immaculate Mary Queen of Scots. Having conjured up in their imagination the image of an ideal goddess, they have sacrificed, to the object of their adoration, all the characters which, in that age, were most estimable for learning, patriotism, integrity, and religion, as if the quarrel which they had espoused had exempted them from the ordinary rules of controversial warfare, and conferred on them the absolute and indefeasible privilege of calumniating and defaming at pleasure; they have pronounced every person who spoke, wrote, or acted against that Queen, to be a hypocrite or a villain." In the raving style of these writers, Knox was, "a fanatical incendiary, a holy savage, the son of violence and barbarism, the religious sachem of religious Mohawks."—[Whitaker's Vindication of Queen Mary, *passim*.] The same writer [Whitaker] speaks of Buchanan as "a serpent—a daring calumniator—leviathan of slander—the second of all human forgers, and the first of all human slanderers." Dr. Robertson he calls, "a disciple of the old school of slander—a liar—and one for whom bedlam is no bedlam." After these citations, we need scarcely apprise the reader, that among the objects of Whitaker's gross scurrility, none fare worse than Elizabeth and her great Minister. We are obliged to Dr. McCrie, therefore, for saving us the trouble of entering into particulars. As to *Knox*, we should wish to refer, not only to the work of his excellent biographer, but to the sanction given to his opinions and representation of Scottish affairs at this period, by the Edinburgh Reviewers, July 1812, No. xxxix.

The first object of Morton, on obtaining the Regency, seems to have been to divide the Queen's party; and it is *asserted*, that he was specially directed by the English Council, through the ministry of *Killebrew*, to take advantage of what had passed in France, and to *excite a terror* amongst his countrymen of a similar massacre, if the French influence should be suffered to continue in its former force. But, indeed, the Scotch must have been extremely supine, and indifferent to the visible course of things, if they had not been appalled by what was going forward on the Continent, and if the Protestants, at the least, had not collected from those proceedings, a forewarning of their own fate, if Popery were allowed to extend its ravages. They *must* have known, that whatever pretences had been set up by the French King to the



contrary, the massacres in that country had been entirely directed against the *Protestants*; and they *might* have known, in one month only at the most, after Morton's elevation, that Pope Gregory XIII., had caused a jubilee to be proclaimed (to be observed on the 7th day of December), among other reasons, for the *happy success of the Most Christian King against the heretics*; and which in the bull itself,\* (to be seen in the Appendix to Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, No. lxviii.) was made to *take the lead of all the other causes*, which were *these*: for the victory of the Christians against the Turk (under the *Spaniards* particularly, and John of Austria, whose banner, as one wrote, floated with an inscription of—"Extermination to the *Protestant* faith"); for the conservation of Flanders (under the tyrannical rule of the Duke of *Alva*); and for the election of the Duc d'Anjou to be King of Poland (contrary to the wishes of a large party there, known to be horror-struck with the French cruelties). For *all these causes*, every one of which was evidently connected with the *triumphs* of the *Catholics*, the jubilee of Pope Gregory had been proclaimed throughout Europe, particularly "praying God," as the bull ran, "to give grace and virtue to the Most Christian King, Charles IX., to pursue the salutary and blessed enterprise he had undertaken, of purging his realm from all heresies, and bringing back and restoring the Catholic Church to its integrity and ancient splendour."† This, surely, was speaking out sufficiently to awaken the Protestants to a sense of their danger, and when coupled with what was known to have been agreed on in the treaty of Bayonne, as well as

\* Translated into the French language, the more directly, as it has been observed, to *quiet* the *minds* of the disturbed subjects of Charles IX.; it was found by Strype among Lord Burghley's papers: and another writing, in Latin, purporting to be "*Scriptum cujusdam Sanguinarii Pontificii, acceptum in Octobri anno 1572, a quodam magni nominis Viro,*"—and endorsed by Lord Burghley himself, "*Scriptum missum in Germania contra Protestantés.*" The paper may be seen in the same Appendix, No. lxix, and is well worth reading.

In the Pope's bull (1569), which Camden has transcribed, Elizabeth is styled the *Pretended* Queen of England, and the *Woman* who had seized upon that kingdom.

† "Is it possible," says the author of the Life of Sir Philip Sidney, "to imagine that a panegyrist should be found to celebrate this deed of treachery and relentless cruelty; alas! such a panegyrist did really appear in the person of M. *Antonius Muretus*, the pupil of *Scaliger*, and one of the most learned and elegant writers of his time. In an oration, illuminated with all the splendour of Ciceronian eloquence, and delivered at Rome in the presence of *Pope Gregory XIII.*, he congratulated his Holiness on this dishonourable victory over the heretics." One passage, indeed, of this remarkable oration, is worth copying, "*Quâ quidem nocte* (for it all passed by

the decrees of the Council of Trent,\* the Protestants of *all countries*. And it seems, indeed, that without any particular guidance or direction, much more any undue influence, the Scots had sense enough to be “awakened by the beacons in France (as Sir Thomas Smith wrote to Walsingham), to provide for their own safety, and to become suspicious of their Gallic neighbours.”\* And these fears and apprehensions had the effect of disposing many of the Queen’s friends to unite with those of the existing government, and to fall into agreement with them, as to the wisdom and prudence of submitting to the rule of a Protestant king; so that the two parties in Scotland, in consequence of what had happened in France, began *naturally* to incline more to each other, or to express it, in the very words of Strype, “to draw nearer and nearer to an accord, to which the cruelty in France helped not a little.” It was therefore apparently unnecessary for Killegrew to be very earnest with the Regent to encourage and keep up a terror of such doings; and, indeed, Dr. Stuart himself acknowledges, that the massacre was immediately interpreted to be a natural consequence of the confederacy which had been formed at Bayonne, for the *extermination* of the *reformed*. It is, nevertheless, pretended to this day, we are sorry to say, that the accounts of the French massacre were artfully exaggerated, to keep alive the apprehensions of a Popish conspiracy, and “give additional weight to the arguments of *Burleigh*, and the other *enemies* of the Queen of Scots.”—*Lingard*.

We are the more particular in this, because there is nothing, perhaps, so difficult to account for in the History of the Life and Administration of Lord Burghley, as the *secret instructions* given to Killegrew, upon his embassy to

night), *stellas equidem luxisse solito nitidius arbitror, et flumen sequanam majores undas volvisse, quo citius impurorum hominum cadavera evolveret et exoneraret in mare.*” This is really dreadful, considering besides, that for fear the Seine should not drown all that were driven into it, Charles IX. sat at his palace window to fire upon those of his unhappy subjects who were on their passage to the river.

\* “The bloody decrees,” as they were called in the preamble to the Acts of the Assembly in Scotland.

† See the Articles of the Ministry, Barons, and Commissioners of the reformed Kirk in Scotland, Oct. 20, 1572, Strype’s Annals, ii. 267. But before this, on the 14th of September, Walsingham had written to Sir Thomas Smith, from Paris, “The Lord Levingston and divers other Scottish gentlemen who see here no way to enjoy the liberty of their conscience, do desire passport, wherein I mean to use less difficulty than heretofore I have done; for that they seem upon the last accident, to desire most perfect amity between the two crowns of England and

Scotland, in the course of this year, and which happen to be still extant in the handwriting of Lord Burghley; it is impossible, we think, to read them without some feelings of disgust and horror. We cannot, with any honesty, turn aside from them. "In opere suscepto," says the honest *Thuanus*, "nisi officio deesse vellem æque mihi flagitiosum *silentium*, quam mendacium ipsum *vitandum*." We would willingly adopt another sentiment of the same writer to be found in his celebrated letters to Camden in defence of Murray; "De cætero *nigrum*, in *candidum* in cuiusquam gratiam convertere neque animus ab initio fuit neque nunc esse debuit." Accustomed to look back to Elizabeth and her very able counsellors, as, in a high degree, the authors of England's glory, greatness, freedom, and independence, long before we engaged in the present work, the candid reader, we hope, will allow for our anxiety to rescue, if possible, such reputed benefactors to the country in which we live, from the *heavy, gross, and unqualified* censures of a set of writers notoriously partial; and *that*, in a cause, where, without their *assistance*, all the best feelings and principles of human nature, might be expected at once to take a decided part. The candid reader, we hope, will be prepared to give us credit for the pain we must have felt, to find that the fame of Lord Burghley was so deeply implicated in this very melancholy story; but that he was not sensible himself (however much appearances may now seem against him) of being actuated by any positively *malignant* principle, as some would infer, we ought in common justice to believe, from the warm resentment he is known to have expressed in his lifetime, of precisely such an accusation, in the case of the Queen of Scots and the Duke of Norfolk. "God amend *his* spirit, and confound his *malice*," said he of the author of a libel against himself and the Lord Keeper, published in this very year in France; "and for *my* part, *if I have any such malicious or malignant spirit*, God presently so confound my body to ashes, and my

Scotland, in respect of the common cause of religion. I suppose, passing by that way, and receiving good entertainment at her Majesty's hands, they will rather do good than harm at home, by making them in the country understand what had passed here, and the danger that is like to follow, without perfect union between the said crowns."—*Compl. Ambass.* 244. See on the Articles of the Kirk of Scotland, McCrie's *Life of Knox*, ii. 216, &c. Knox being yet living, was not sparing of the perpetrators of the bloody deed; from the pulpit at Edinburgh, he thundered the vengeance of heaven against that cruel murderer and false traitor, the King of France, and desired Le Croc, the French Ambassador, to tell his master, "that sentence was pronounced against him in Scotland, and that the divine vengeance would never depart from him, nor from his house, if repentance did not ensue." The Ambassador applied to the Regent to have him silenced, but it was refused.



soul to perpetual torments in hell." [*Compl. Ambassad.* 317.] Nothing surely but a deep sense of injury, and resentment of *unjust* accusations, could have drawn from him such extraordinary and indignant expressions, especially if we consider that it has been asserted by one who had been much in the way to mark his even temper, that "in thirty years together, he was seldom known to be angry." [*Life by a Domestic.*] It may not be amiss to add, what Lord Burghley further expressed, both of himself and his near relative, the Lord Keeper: "God send this estate no worse-meaning servants, than we two have been, who indeed spared not labour nor care to serve our Queen and country; and if we *had not*, we may truly avow, neither our Queen nor country had enjoyed that common repose that it has done." [*Compl. Amb.* 317. See also the postscript to the above letter.] It may be observed that of this libel, *Camden* says, "it was intended to bring *them* into hatred with the Prince and the people, *who* by their wisdoms and diligent care had prevented, or broken their designs and wicked hopes." The Queen was exceedingly offended, and issued a proclamation, declaring the charges against the two great Counsellors, to be mere slanders.

It may be seen that by the secret instructions\* to which we are referring, *Killegrew* had two most important commissions intrusted to him. The first was, to apprise some of the "principal persons of either party of the late horrible, universal murder, in France, and thereupon to move them to have good regard to that state, that the like be not there attempted." As this might touch the Queen's party, it has been judged by those who have taken that side of the question, that this was a plain contradiction of the avowed purposes of *Killegrew's* mission, which were, to agree and *conciliate* the *two parties*; whereas this they say, had a tendency to foment the differences, by setting the Protestant or King's party more than ever against the Queen's *Catholic* friends, and her *French* connexions; but in truth, if the French massacre were likely to work upon the minds of the Queen's party, and dispose them, more than had been looked for, to unite with those who sided with the King and the Protestants, *Killegrew's* avowed and secret instructions might be brought to agree in the main, that is, by operating upon the fears of the party heretofore connected with the French, he might bring the whole kingdom into a more promising state of accord, and fulfil, to the utmost of the terms, the ostensible object of his commission, which was, to agree and reconcile the two contending parties, concluding that the Catholics them-

\* They are printed in Murdin.

selves, might now be disposed to turn from the French ; and indeed there seems to have been a great chance of this, the Queen's party having become much weakened after the death of the Duke of Norfolk, and reasonable hopes being entertained, that if those who kept the Castle of Edinburgh, could be brought over, the whole kingdom might in a short time be made to submit to the King's authority. The party in the Castle, however, were so buoyed up with the hopes and expectations of succours from abroad, prepared, if not to rescue Mary, to convey her son out of the kingdom, that they only sought to temporise in their negotiations, and drive off matters till the succours they expected, particularly from the Duke of Alva, should arrive.

But the other commission intrusted to Killegrew, by the *secret* instructions with which he was supplied, must appear to equal, we are sorry to say, some of the worst proceedings in France ; in fact, it was to promote, if he could, a requisition from the Government in Scotland, to procure Mary to be delivered up, for the express purpose of being there *tried* and *executed* !

Accustomed as we were, in common with the rest of the world, before we undertook to write the Life of Lord Burghley, to sicken at the accounts given of Elizabeth's persecution of the Scottish Queen, we should have supposed it impossible to get over such a document as this, with any qualification of the horrible mandate, but from a more perfect acquaintance with the exact circumstances of the times, we shall venture to advance something in explanation, at least, even of this horrid proposal. We do not hesitate to say, we have bestowed the utmost consideration upon the case, and shall now therefore present the reader with the result of our investigation.

The Secret Instructions, which may be seen in Murdin, p. 224, are dated September 10, 1572, *seventeen days only* after the massacre of St. Bartholomew ; and not so many, of course, after the reception of the intelligence of that horrible catastrophe by the English Court. Killegrew was to be dismissed to Scotland, to see what could be done upon this emergency, which seemed evidently to threaten the whole Protestant interests,\* and must therefore have appeared to

\* Lord Burghley professed to some of his friends, that he was " at his wits end ;" and his friend, the Archbishop, gave way to the most dismal apprehensions upon hearing it. He wrote to the Lord Treasurer upon it, though not very intelligibly, as his letters are transcribed by Strype ; but thus much is evident, that the Queen appears not to have been so much alarmed as her friends wished her to be ; not so suspicious of the Papists' designs as was consistent with her own safety. This led the Archbishop to express himself to the Treasurer, then on progress with the Queen, in

the English Council, rather favourable than otherwise to the *King's* cause in that divided country. But to the internal peace and quiet of both kingdoms, Mary was still a dreadful obstacle. She was the direct rival and competitor of Elizabeth, in the eyes of all the Catholics of Europe. She was, it is true, in custody, but a very *unsafe* custody; there was no knowing how soon she might be rescued, and there was no doubting as to the *issue* of such a *rescue*.\* She could only be delivered by *those* who were the *inveterate enemies* of *Elizabeth*, and of the established government of the realm, in church and state. Four months only had elapsed since Elizabeth had dismissed her Parliament, with an implied rejection of their proposals to bring Mary to trial, as the chief security to herself, her person, and her crown. As long ago as in the year 1568, Mary had been denounced by her own Scottish subjects as deserving of death; and preceding Regents, as the instructions set forth, *had asked* to have her *delivered up* by the *English Court*, to be proceeded against by the *way of justice*. Repeated insinuations had been pressed upon the Government at home, that the removal of Mary was an indispensable step to the peace and tranquillity of England; that, in short, the life of Mary was the death of Elizabeth,† and that

the following terms: “I pray God ye bring home the Queen’s Majesty well, and yourself with her. They [the Papists] be full of spite and secret malice;” and alluding to Mary, “If that only desperate person were away, as by justice soon it might be, the Queen’s Majesty’s good subjects would be in better hopes, and the Papists’ daily expectations vanquished.” Sandys, Bishop of London, wrote in much the same strain to the Lord Treasurer, accounting the Scotch Queen the chief cause of all danger.

\* It would be perhaps difficult to say who was most careful at this time about Mary’s safe keeping. It appears from some letters in *Lodge*, from the Lords Shrewsbury, Burghley, and Leicester, that complaints were made, towards the close of this year, of her not being so straitly kept as the times required. Lord Shrewsbury was complained of because he occasionally absented himself from Sheffield Castle to take the air.—See *Lodge*, vol. ii. letter lxxv. From this charge Lord Burghley defended him, so that it appears there were others more watchful upon this point than himself. Leicester wrote to caution Lord Shrewsbury, about the same time. “Nevertheless,” says he, “I perceive you have need to look well about you, for there is [are] many eyes upon you.” Letter lxxvi.—He speaks in this letter of Queen Elizabeth’s consideration for Mary, and seeks to explain some things, of which Mary had complained, in a letter addressed by that Queen to himself and Lord Burghley.—See letter from Lord Burghley on the same, No. lxxvii.

† How much soever this expression may be scoffed at and vilified by Mary’s apologists, we consider it as containing a great deal of truth; as expressing the views of the two great parties into which Europe was divided at that time. Dr. Stuart speaks thus contemptuously of the English alarms:—“The *Protestants* were every where transported with rage against the *Papists*. Elizabeth prepared herself against an attack from the Roman Catholic powers; and was *haunted* with the *notion* that they meant to invade her kingdom, and to give it to the Queen of Scots. Her



any concordance or community of interests, with regard to those eminent and illustrious personages, was as little to be looked for, as the union of fire and water, or any other opposites in nature; and, in the mean while, to cite the very words of Killegrew's secret instructions, "It began to be found daily, more and more, that the continuance of the Q. of Scots in England was so *dangerous*, both for the person of the *Queen's Majesty*, and for her *state*, and *realm*, as nothing presently could be more necessary, than that the realm might be delivered of her, and though by justice [as the late Parliament had decided], this might be done in *this* realm, yet, for certain respects, it seemed better that she should be delivered into Scotland."\*

The proposal seems certainly very horrible, but we must remember that it was only a *proposal*. Killegrew was to see if things could be brought to such an issue in *Scotland*—a plain proof that some *repugnance* existed to the bringing them to *that issue* in England; nor should we omit to look at the alternative.

Ambassador at Paris, Sir Francis Walsingham, augmented her apprehensions and terror: he compared her weakness with the strength of her enemies, and assured her, that if they should possess themselves of Scotland, she would soon cease to be Queen." It was *his duty* to tell her so if he *thought so*, and for our own part, we *thoroughly believe* he told the *truth*. Elizabeth was not a woman to be *haunted* with *vain* fears and *idle* apprehensions; and as for being transported with rage against the Papists, *generally*, she was at this very time suspected of being a Papist herself, by the *Puritans*, for her *lenity* towards the *former*, and particularly for *not bringing Mary at once to trial*. Of the evil designs against *her*, who can possibly doubt, when such evidence is to be Produced as the testimony of the contemporary biographers of Pius V., *Catena* and *Gabutius*, the former of whom positively asserts it to have been the design of *Pius*: "De socorre la reina de Scotia, e liberar la—de restituir la religione in Inghillerre—e di levare a un tempo la sentina di tanti mali Elizabetta;" or in the words of *Gabutius*, some taken from the Pope's own mouth, "Lapsam in Angliâ religionem renovare, *simul* et illam malorum omnium sentinam [Eliz<sup>ma</sup>.], seu ut appellabat *ipse*, flagitiorum servam, *de medio tollere*." Speaking also of the commission given to Ridolpho (Ridolfi), *Catena* affirms that he was charged, "movesse gli animi ab sollevamento per *distruttione* d'Elizabatta:" *Gabutius*, "Incolarum animas ad Elizabethæ *perditionem* rebellione facta, commovere." How much more in the secret were the actual servants and officers of the Papal See, than Mary's advocates of the eighteenth century!

\* In a conference Sir Thomas Smith, who was certainly by nature no blood-thirsty man, had with Charles IX., when treating for peace between the two countries, the King having proposed to have the Queen of Scots included in the treaty, being his kinswoman. "And so," said Sir Thomas, "she is to my mistress; but if she were your daughter, or your son, if he or she would procure your death, or to have your crown from you, would you not see justice done on him or her that should attempt it, rather than to be still in danger?" Killegrew was present at this very conference, and then made the observation in the text, that fire and water might as well be expected to subsist together, as the English and Scottish Queens.

If no such demand, with its consequences, could be brought about, what was then to be done? Why, in truth, Mary was to continue still to live in England, at the expense, and to the continuance of *danger to Elizabeth*; and things terminated in this very alternative. Mary was *not* demanded by the Scottish authorities, to be disposed of in *the way of justice*, and the consequence was, not that she was brought to justice and summary punishment in England, but *suffered to live*, and continue in the custody of the Earl of Shrewsbury, one of the first of the Nobility of the realm.

We *do* believe, indeed we cannot attempt to deny, that if she had, *at that time*, been demanded by the Scottish authorities, she would have been delivered up, and probably lost her life. It is very melancholy to have such points to concede in the life of a man, pronounced upon various other occasions to be “mild,” “merciful,” of “a liberal, benign, and kind disposition;” and yet so the case really is.\* Lord Burghley himself, seems undoubtedly to have penned these secret instructions, but, upon no other motive, we shall venture to add, than an invincible persuasion at the time,† that the safety of one Queen was incompatible with the life of the other; a case indeed decided but a few months before by the *Parliament*, and very much confirmed by the testimony of those who were most in the way of judging of the temper and disposition of the Catholic states of Europe, Mary’s *great friends* and *abettors*; and exactly in the same proportion, the *bitter enemies* of *Elizabeth* and her *Ministers*. We, who write of these things almost three centuries afterwards, must be expected, on the score of feeling, to

\* The character given by several writers to Bishop (afterwards Archbishop) *Sandys*, is, that he was *mild* and *benevolent*, and yet no man could be more convinced than he appears to have been at this time, that the chief remedy to be sought was, “Furthwith to cutte off the Scottish Quenes heade: *Ipsa est nostri fundi calamitas*.”—See his letter to Lord Burghley, Sept. 5, 1572, in the 2d Series of Ellis’s Original Letters, No. xcii. Mr. Turner’s remarks on the state of things at this time, in Book ii. chap. xxx. of his *Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, are certainly very much to the purpose.

† In a letter written from Woodstock by Lord Burghley to Lord Shrewsbury, dated September 7, not more than a fortnight after the massacre, and only three days before the penning of the instructions to Killebrew, he writes, “These French tragedies, and ending of unlucky marriage with blood and vile murders, cannot be expressed with tongue to declare the cruelties. These fires may be doubted that their flames may come both hither and into Scotland; for such cruelties have large scope. God save our gracious Queen, who now assembleth her Council, that may consult what is to be done for some surety. We have sent Killebrew this day into Scotland.—*All men now cry out of your prisoner*,” viz. the Queen of Scots. The instructions therefore which are dated on the 10th, were probably the result of the Council’s meeting, and sent after Killebrew.—See *Lodge*, ii. 75.

sympathize with Mary; but we can scarcely, in justice, expect the same of those who had to defend Elizabeth, her person, her crown, and her Protestant Church, from machinations the most destructive in design, intrigues the most subtle and pernicious, and an opposition which could brook no competition of interests. Mary ultimately fell a sacrifice to the politics of the times; but it was after a long delay and procrastination of the fatal stroke.\* Had things taken the opposite turn, even in the course of the year of which we are writing, we are entirely persuaded that Elizabeth, and her chief Counsellors, would have been brought to a much more speedy and ignominious end: in truth, they only very narrowly escaped such a catastrophe, as we have had occasion to shew.

We have repeatedly observed, that dangers averted afford every opportunity to those from whom they were expected to arise, to deny the existence of them; and a general inclination to lessen the credit of all the dangers to which Elizabeth is said to have been exposed at this period, is to be traced through the whole of the writings of the advocates of Mary. Such is the inveterate malice or hatred with which they speak of all the acts of Elizabeth and her Ministers, that we are scarcely expected to believe that Elizabeth had *any real* enemies, or that her Ministers had *any reason* to distrust the *fair speeches* with which they were continually entertained by foreign Courts, and their Ministers; as well as by Mary and her commissioners; and perhaps never more than in the course of this year. The great question of Mary's guilt or innocence at the time of her dethronement, had been for some while suffered to sleep, but in this "year

On the 8th of September, Lord Leicester also wrote to the Earl, from the same place, and in his letter has these words, alluding to the destruction of the Protestants:—"God defend our Mistress from the hidden practices laid for her among these open facts committed so nearly to touch her; for she is the fountain and well-spring of the griefs that procureth this malice, and though others smart, *yet she is the mark they shoot at*; and so must she think, and accordingly must she provide, or else all will be nought."—See also *Strype's Annals*, ii. 243-4. Mr. Lodge, in his *Illustrations of History*, has added a note to the above letter, which, with many others of his notes, might, we think, have been well spared. An editor of such valuable originals, would have done well to have left them, in all instances, to speak for themselves.

\* Dr. Gilbert Stuart says, Elizabeth was always looking forward with anxiety to the period when she might throw aside all reserve, without danger, and conduct this unfortunate prisoner to the scaffold. This we are far from believing.—Eighteen years, to say the least, was a long time to wait for such an opportunity, especially while Elizabeth's danger from the detention of Mary was constantly increasing. Mary seemed, for many years, to be moving all Europe to dispatch Elizabeth, and yet lived in personal security herself all the while, though in the power of such an inveterate and blood-thirsty enemy (*if Mary's advocates are to be believed*), as no female ever had before.



of much action," as Strype calls it, it began to be revived, and as is generally the case, where opposites are insisted upon, it seems difficult to say, which party digressed farthest from the absolute truth.—We allude now to two publications which made a great noise about this time, "The Defence of Queen Mary's Honour," by Bishop Lesley (Leslie), and the "*Detectio Mariæ*," by Buchanan; and in regard to both of which some unworthy deceptions appear to have been practised; the first it seems had been printed with great secrecy and without any name\* or license, in London, in the year 1569.—In the year 1571 the book was reprinted at Leige, under the name of Morgan Phillipps, Batchelor of Divinity, as a *new* work, and some copies being sent over with Charles Bailly, a Fleming, one of Queen Mary's servants, they were seized at Dover and suppressed. It seems to be admitted that the work bears the marks of *party*, but is otherwise argumentative and eloquent.† We may suppose that by the "marks of party," is meant an overstrained defence of Mary's honour. It is held to be "remarkable," by the author just cited, "that no answer was made to it by any of the partizans of Elizabeth, or by the adherents of Murray or Morton;" but, in fact, an answer seems to have been *ready made* in the "*Detectio Mariæ*" of Buchanan, if a writing previously in existence can be called an answer; for we are disposed to think that under whatever circumstances the Detection was brought forward at this time, it was probably the same as the Book of Articles exhibited before the Privy Council in 1568,‡ purporting to be "a collection of the presumptions and circumstances from which it should appear, that as the Earl Bothwell was the chief murderer of the King, so was the Queen a deviser and maintainer thereof." The charges which the Book of Articles contained against Mary were probably known to Leslie, and his Defence in all likelihood was adapted and designed to break the force of them, but in the truth of those charges others were deeply interested; if Mary were *quite innocent*, and her honour admitted of a *full defence*, the conduct of those who had either in her own country or this, put a restraint upon her liberty, must have been atrocious in the extreme; we cannot deny it; we would not be thought willing to deny it. The time has been, when we were as ready as any of our readers can be, to follow Mary with sorrow and concern into the fastnesses of Lochleven, deplore her sufferings, detest her persecutors, and rejoice at her deliverance by the chivalrous efforts of the younger Douglas; but the sobriety of real history requires that we

\* Or rather under a fictitious or assumed name, *Eusebius Dicaeophile*.

† Gilbert Stuart.

‡ See *Laing's Dissertation* on the Murder of Darnley, 161, 169.

should pause, and examine things more narrowly, before we consent to scatter indiscriminate blame, on all who had to take a contrary part, there having been more at stake perhaps in this particular struggle, than in any other which history records. Leslie's Defence is allowed to have borne "marks of party;" the party opposed to him must therefore have felt touched by it, and if they detected *untruths* in it,\* must have been expected to suppress it, or to use endeavours to

\* We have the testimony of Lord Burghley himself to its containing one "notable lye;" viz., that "all the Noblemen that heard Queen Mary's cause did judge her innocent."—See *Cabala*, 174. More generally of the book itself he says (in a letter addressed to Sir Henry Norris), "Of late the Bishop of Ross caused one of his servants secretly to procure the printing of a book in *English*, whereof, before eight leaves could be finished, intelligence was had; which book tendeth to set forth to the world, that the Queen of Scots was not guilty of her husband's death, a parable [quære, Paradox?] in many men's opinions; next that she is a lawful heir to the crown, and herewith such reasons inserted as make unsound conclusions for the Queen's Majesty's present state."—*Ibid.* We have in this last clause sufficient reason for suppressing the book, whatever might be said in it of Mary's honour or dishonour: but what a strange defender of Mary's honour must Leslie have been, after the acknowledgment made to Dr. Wylson, to be seen in *Murdin*. On the 8th of November, 1571, Leslie wrote to Mary from the Tower, informing her, that as all her letters to the Duke of Norfolk, as well as his own, had been discovered, and the proceedings with the *Pope*, *Spain*, the Duke of *Alva*, &c. fully become known to *Elizabeth* and her *Ministers*, it was in vain for him, on examination, to attempt to deny any thing; so that he had confessed all. This letter is very curious, but what is more curious, on the very same day, Dr. Wylson, after a conference in the Tower with Leslie, wrote to Lord Burghley, as follows: "The Bishop seemeth to me to be very glad that these practices are come to light, saying they are all naught; and he hopeth that when folk will cease to be lewd, his Mistress shall speed the better. He saith farther, upon speech that I had with him, that the Queen his Mistress is not fit for any husband; for first, he saith, she poisoned her husband, the French King, as he has credibly understood; again, she hath consented to the murder of her late husband the Earl of Darnley; thirdly, she matched with the murderer and brought him to the field to be murdered; and last of all, she pretended marriage with the Duke, with whom, as he thinketh, she would not long have kept faith, and the Duke should not have had the best days with her. Lord, what people are these, what a Queen and what an ambassador."—*Murdin*, 57, from the original.—In fact, it may be added, the pretended marriage with Norfolk was not the "last of all," for she was, by her own account, before the Duke's execution, encouraging the *Spaniard* to think she would marry *John of Austria*, but still promising to keep faith with *Norfolk*. It is singular enough, but eight days only after the above letter of Dr. Wylson to Lord Burghley, the Bishop wrote himself to his Lordship, in a letter addressed to the Right Honourable, my very good Lord, my Lord Burghley, and beginning, "I am sorry of your Lordship's present disease, and would to God I were as good a physician to cure your Lordship, as you may, and I trust shall be, for my present relief, for then your Lordship should not be long in pain."—In another letter, *Murdin*, p. 60, he speaks of Lord Burghley's "Truth and honest part keepest to all men, as commonly reported, and of which he himself had had experience."

counteract the impressions it was calculated to make. Both these things seem to have taken place ; the copies that fell into the hands of Government were suppressed, but as many remained to circulate among the enemies or friends of Elizabeth abroad, what less could be done by those who really judged Mary to be guilty, and therefore the cause in a great degree of her own sufferings and restraint, than to put forth such proof of her misdoings as might at least undeceive those who were in the way to be misled by the party statements of Bishop Leslie. All these things we conceive to have fallen quite within the course of what might naturally have been expected, and can therefore understand, while we lament, the measures to which Lord Burghley himself seems to have had recourse, to *disgrace* \* Mary in the eyes of foreigners, or in other words, for so we think his own terms should be interpreted, to shew the grounds upon which she had been removed from the exercise of her authority by her own subjects, as the true causes of her misfortunes. It should be remembered that, in the eyes

\* This term was, we must confess, so used by Lord Burghley or the Queen, in the Instructions sent to the English Minister in France, as to afford the advocates of Mary a very fair handle for assuming that she was to be disgraced at any hazard of violating the truth ; but it should be remembered, that she had been sufficiently *disgraced* already, by the loud and popular charges against her, as having at the least married the murderer of her husband ; nay those who had some character to keep up in the world, such as Sir Ralph Sadler, for instance, if not the Duke of Norfolk himself, had called her a murderess and adulteress, believing her to be so from the evidences produced, but it may be said to remain to this day an undecided question, which was most *honest* or most *dishonest*, Leslie or Buchanan. If the latter were honest, Leslie's contrary statements deserved to be suppressed, as far as they could be ; and where they could not, it would seem natural, that Buchanan's *counter*-statements should be made known. That Lord Burghley, who has been so exceedingly ill spoken of, for his care to publish and disperse abroad the *Detectio Mariæ*, had yet some feeling for Mary, would appear from the following remarkable passage in a letter from Bishop Leslie himself, the author of the *Defence* of Mary's Honour, to her servant, Charles Bailly, then in custody for having brought *the Defence* into England. Speaking of his appearance before the Council, the Bishop writes, " J'ay reçu trois de vos lettres, par lesquelles, j'ay entendu vos responses aux demandes de my Lord *Burley*, lesquelles sont fort bien à propos. Je vous prie n'ayez point de peur, pource qu'ils ne peuvent faire aucune dishonneur ni dommage a vostre personne, et quant aux *menaces* de my Lord *Burley*, il ne sont que parolles ; et combien qu' il parle rudement, neanmoins il sera trouvé le meilleur ami pour vostre liberté. Et en cas que vous lui trouvez seul, dictes lui hardiment en secret, que la *Royne d' Escosse* est vostre maitresse ; se fyant en lui et pour l' amour d' elle vous lui pouvez vous aider estre mise en liberté. Car il m'a promis se travailler pour vous."—*Murdin*, 6 ; see also p. 9. *Mad<sup>lle</sup>. de Keralio*, one of the most impassioned defenders of Mary, though on most other occasions an admirer of Elizabeth, admits, that this plot was so adroitly managed, and secretly and deceitfully carried on, as to have nearly baffled the vigilance, and escaped the detection of *CECIL*.



of many of his contemporaries, Buchanan passed for a faithful historian, nor is his credit universally shaken to this day ; \* the strong testimony of Thuanus, in defiance of Camden, and even of his royal co-adjutor, James I., will ever remain as a remarkable vindication of Buchanan's veracity, and may reasonably dispose us to believe, that after all, he might not be wrong in his accusations of Mary. And if she were *guilty*, why were *others* to suffer from any *false* assertions of her *innocence*? and suffer besides to such an extent, as Elizabeth and her Ministers were likely to do, from any wrong impressions made upon the minds of foreigners?

It is not to be wondered that in this distressing struggle, every body's eye should be fixed upon Mary ; she was ultimately the greatest sufferer, and she suffered in such a manner, as to obliterate, if not to atone for, all her previous transgressions ; but the consummation of her sufferings came on step by step, and it is step by step that we must investigate its causes. We do in our own minds thoroughly believe, that Mary *was disgraced* before she took refuge in England ; that Darnley's death, and her marriage with Bothwell ruined her character, and, considering her foreign connexions, rendered her unfit to rule in Scotland in so remarkable a crisis of affairs in Church and State ; a crisis, as much affecting England as Scotland on the ground of religion. But as much as Mary is the leading and prominent object of modern inquiries, Elizabeth must have been the leading and prominent object in the eyes of *Europe*, at the period of which we are writing. Daughter of the first English Sovereign who had thrown off the yoke of Rome—Sister of the first purely Protestant Sovereign of England—Successor of a restorer of the Catholic faith, after a temporary interruption, and bent upon again shaking off the authority of the Pope, it is impossible to suppose that she could be less than a marked object of Catholic jealousy and suspicion ; and Mary's unfortunate connexion with the crown of England through Henry VII., could not fail to point *her* out (especially considering the capricious proceedings of Henry VIII. with regard to the succession), as a marked competitor of Elizabeth, if *any* advantages could at *any* time be obtained against the latter. Henry II. of France, had given sufficient

\* See article Buchanan in *Bayle's Dictionary*, and in the *Biographia Britannica*. If the suppression of Leslie's Vindication is to be regarded, as some pretend, as a strong proof of its containing *unwelcome* truths (see before) ; Buchanan's History had a like *confirmation* bestowed upon it by the Scottish Parliament, in 1584, "to the greater diffusion of the author's reputation," which are the very words of *Dr. Stuart*, vol. ii. 194.

intimation of the sense entertained abroad of Mary's *superior* claim to the English crown, and nothing but the high spirit of Elizabeth, and the extraordinary vigilance of her Ministers, could possibly, we may venture to say, have defeated the projects formed for the transfer of the crown to Mary, from the very period of Elizabeth's accession. However often, and however earnestly, Mary might afterwards seem to disclaim all pretensions during the life of Elizabeth, it was impossible not to perceive, that her *foreign connexions* had never abandoned her claims, and that in fact, the downfall of Elizabeth and the elevation of Mary to the English throne, were constantly in the view of the *Papists*, whether in *Scotland* or at *Rome*; in *Spain, France, Flanders, or Germany*.\*

To defend Elizabeth therefore from such a combination of foreign interests, and such a competitor close at hand, was the leading object, we may be sure, of her principal Ministers, and we cannot wonder that they should have been prone to take advantage of every incident likely to incline the balance on her side. Mary's irregularities in Scotland had this effect, by leading to her deposition by the Parliament there, and the consequences were such as might have been expected, considering that she had a son in whose name, as her immediate heir, the government might be carried on; for had Murray ascended the throne in his own name, there would have been so manifest an usurpation, as greatly to have altered the case. But with this, in fact, we have no more to do than to shew, that whenever attempts were made to assert Mary's *perfect innocence*, it altered the whole character of the proceedings against her in her own country, before she came into England, and of course had the effect of imputing to Elizabeth and her Council such *wanton* barbarities as were never before heard of; such barbarities in short as are still imputed to them by Mary's apologists, and which ought to be contradicted, as they were contradicted at the time, by any counter-statements that may be produceable. The *Detectio Mariæ*, proceeding from the pen of *Buchanan*, had certainly a harshness in it, as directed against a known benefactress, that will always bear hard upon the reputation of that learned man; but it was *defensive* as regarded *Murray*, and *many others*; and if it contained truths, as opposed to notorious falsehoods, its evidence is not to be despised, much less overlooked, as connected with the transactions of the year 1572, in which the *Papists* were all looking for their "golden day" (as they called the restoration of their religion in England, and Elizabeth's deprivation),

\* See Strype's Annals, ii. 263, 264.—We must again refer to Mr. Turner's recent history for a fuller account of the grand *Papal conspiracy* against *England*, after *Catena* and *Gabutius*.

and when they were busy in all parts; in Spain, and France, and Rome, by secret councils and intrigues (which scarcely the vigilance of Walsingham could detect), all intended for the deliverance of Mary and *overthrow of Elizabeth*; and in England itself by prophesyings, conjurations, and hidden treasons, of which the Government was continually receiving information, not from any suspicious authority, but from the loyal and faithful amongst the Queen's subjects, who had their eyes upon what was passing around them, and guessed from what they saw, that every preparation was going forward for a formidable rebellion. In August, indeed, the execution of the Earl of Northumberland, for the part he took in the rebellion of 1569, seemed greatly to increase the malice of the Papists,\* and the number of the Queen of Scots' friends, as Walsingham was able to discover, through a Popish spy at Paris, who had been in England, and had reported to the French King and the Duke of Guise, that some practice was in hand for that Queen's deliverance, whose party was nearly strong enough to encounter any forces Elizabeth could oppose to them.

The Lord Treasurer was by no means exempt this busy year, from his usual cares and troubles relating to the *Church*; and indeed it is very extraordinary, considering the great pressure of other business, that he should have been able or inclined to pay the attention to such matters as appears to have been the case; but his connexion with Cambridge rather forced them upon him. This indeed was the year when the *Admonition to Parliament* appeared; in which the Puritans or Disciplinarians seemed to put forth their whole strength,† to unsettle the established order and government of the Church, as savouring too much of Popery, and not carrying the Reformation far enough.‡ We have already

\* Sanders had said, Northumberland *suffered martyrdom* at York. Upon which Mr. Turner has lately made the following remark: "A Nobleman wilfully rebelling, and heading an army against the Sovereign, and suffering the legal penalty, was therefore a *martyr* in the estimation of a Romish priest!"

† Cartwright has the credit of being the chief author of it, though others probably joined.

‡ "Non dissimulo, quin argumentis e scriptura, et externarum ecclesiarum exemplo adductus, aliquid abesse putem, quo ecclesia nostra, nuper e tenebris vindicata, proprius ad splendorem *Πρωτοτυπου χαρακτηρος* possit accedere."—*Chark's Sermon at Cambridge ad Clerum*. Chark being censured by the University for this discourse, appealed to Lord Burghley, who at first thinking him hardly used, endeavoured to get him restored to favour, but finding him obstinate and extremely bent against the calling of Archbishops, Bishops, &c. he left him to take his chance. Browning, another Novelist, having (at this time) made his submissions upon a like censure, obtained the Chancellor's full intercession to have him restored. These Novelists in their enmity to the establishment, were accustomed to call the Reformation of the Church of England, a



expressed our opinions upon this point, and endeavoured to shew, that as a question relating only to what might be harmlessly *retained*, upon the separation from the Church of Rome, it was a mere matter of opinion, and one which should rather have been accommodated by reasonable concessions and submission, than brought into such angry debate as turned out to be the case. We are not disposed to deny the learning or abilities of some who were engaged against the establishment in this contest; but we conceive that their learning and abilities, whatever encouragement they might receive from certain persons about the Court, were ill applied, and mischievously exerted in fomenting quarrels,\* of which the Papists were at hand to take advantage, and which brought disgrace on Protestantism generally, or on the principles of the Reformation; sober men wished it *not* to be carried *too far*, to the entire alienation of such Papists as might otherwise be easily reconciled to the establishment. Certain however it is, that the Disciplinarians pursued their designs and purposes, with an unyielding perseverance, approaching to obstinacy and defiance of the existing authorities, and gave great trouble thereby to the worthy Archbishop Parker, and others well affected to the established order of things;† but chiefly to the

*deformed Reformation.* Whitgift, afterwards Archbishop, was the person on whom the task of answering the Admonition chiefly fell; being urged thereto, and assisted in it by Archbishop Parker.—See *Strype's Life of Whitgift*, b. i. ch. vi. vii. As soon as his book was printed, he sent a copy to the Lord Treasurer, with a long letter, the substance of which may be seen in *Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker*, b. iv. ch. xii.

\* This should be constantly borne in mind, in what we say of the Puritans; however learned many of them might be (as was the case certainly with Cartwright), however pious or conscientious, they were quarrelling with what was established by law, and acting in defiance of the law, quite as much as the Papists; claiming to have the use of the national churches, *exclusively upon their own terms*; terms as rigid as any adopted by their opponents; as unfriendly to true liberty of conscience, and free inquiry; for, according to Cartwright's own Directory of Church Government, those to be admitted to *their* ministry were to be *strictly examined*, as to their *life and conversation*, freedom from all contagion of *heresy*, soundness of *faith*, and *consent in all things* to the doctrine received by the Church, including *discipline* of course, for in doctrine they professed to agree with the establishment.

† See for instances of this, the attack upon Bishop Cooper in *Strype's Annals*, vol. ii. b. i. ch. xxi; his *Life of Archbishop Parker*, Whitgift, &c. &c. In the chapter referred to above, relative to Bishop Cooper, the author thus concludes: "I have transcribed this long paper" (the answer to the Bishop's sermon), "that hence might be seen the spirit of this sort of men in these times, rude in language to their superiors, dogmatical, confident in their charges of Popery, persecution, and antichristianism upon this Church and the reformed governors of it, and extolling their *new discipline*."

Lord Treasurer, whom Strype calls, upon this very occasion, alluding to his connexion with the University of Cambridge, the "*kind Chancellor*," and "the *wise and good Lord Treasurer*;" and indeed he seems to have exhibited all these virtues, in the patient hearing he gave to all parties, and the pains he took to reconcile matters, as far as it could be done, without too great sacrifices on the part of the establishment. In the addresses presented to him by both parties, a great confidence was professed in his "singular benevolence," "his regard to justice," his "wisdom," "goodness," exemplary "moderation," and "sound judgment."

But from one quarter he appears to have received an address of a very different nature; we mean from *Dering*, of whom we have spoken before: a man of family and education, and from whom, therefore, better things might have been expected; but he certainly seems to have written very intemperately to the Chancellor, with this good effect, however, that it provoked an answer. "Somewhat stirring," as Strype in his usual way expresses it, "the mild and good nature of that most pious and wise Nobleman, as appears in a letter to him [*Dering*] dated April 3, wherein is seen as well this Lord's modest and Christian deportment, in justifying himself against *Dering*, as *Dering*'s principles and lofty spirit."\*

As this excellent letter (*for so it certainly is*) may be seen in the Appendix to the second vol. of Strype's Annals, No. xx. we shall not attempt to transcribe it; but shall merely observe, that it was replied to by *Dering*, in a Latin letter, "so full of stiffness," says Strype, "and so abounding in his own conceit, that we cannot but gather from it a character of that man's temper and spirit."—This letter also may be seen in Strype's Appendix, No. xxi.

But amidst all these disputes and complaints, the Lord Treasurer's attention to whatever changes, or reformation of things, might be *really*, as he thought, and *essentially* requisite, was unremitted, and even during the Queen's summer progress (whom he almost constantly attended), he drew up certain memorials "of things necessary to be better ordered," the heads of which only, it may be sufficient to notice, as more may be seen in Strype.†

"The state of the *Church and Religion*.

"The obstinate *Contemners* of religion.

"The ministers of the *Law* to be reformed.

\* *Dering* had in fact no few friends at the Council-board, as Collier has observed, (ii. 538.) and Lord Leicester among the number.

† See also Collier, ii. 538.

- “ The houses of *Court* and *Chancery* to be visited.
- “ The councils in the *Marches* of *Wales* and in the *North* to be considered.
- “ The *Commissions* of the *Peace* to be viewed and examined.
- “ Good and faithful men to be made *Sheriffs*.
- “ The *Navy* of the realm to be surveyed.
- “ The statute against *rogues* to be executed.”

As all these things are still to be seen in Lord Burghley's own hand-writing, we have no need to press upon the attention of our readers, such signal proofs of his great and incessant care of all things appertaining to the good of the nation. They may be left still to speak for themselves.

The same noble Lord and good patriot, exerted all his abilities this year and the following, to relieve the Queen's subjects from certain most vexatious processes in regard to concealed lands, forfeitures, &c., which had heretofore exposed them to the extortions and vexatious visits of graceless and wicked men; termed by Lord Coke, in resentment of their unfeeling practices, “ *harpies*” and “ *helluones*,” “ *turbidum hominum genus*.” The articles drawn up by Lord Burghley, that “ great and useful Counsellor,” for these purposes, are also to be seen in Strype's *Annals*, ii. b. i. ch. xxii. They were only six in number, but eminently calculated to check the extortions and mal-practices of the griping Commissioners, who had hitherto been engaged in such inquiries.

The Lord Treasurer was also about this time the author of a bill of great importance to the Bishops and Clergy of the realm, by making the lands, tenements, goods, and chattels of tellers, receivers, under-collectors, &c., liable to the payment of their debts, and to prevent fraudulent deeds, gifts, grants, alienations, &c. This arose out of a case which had occurred in the diocese of Norwich, whereby Parkhurst the bishop, had like to have been a great sufferer. Having intrusted a person with the collection of his tenths to be paid into the Exchequer, the receiver converted the money to his own uses, bought lands with it, and then fraudulently conveyed those lands away to defeat the Bishop of all remedy. The Bishop was of course served with an Exchequer writ to make good the deficiencies, greatly to his distress and embarrassment; but, as the case is fully stated in Strype's *Annals* and other books, we need say no more of it here, except that it will be found to tell greatly to the praise of Lord Burghley, as well as of his friend the worthy Archbishop, who interested himself much in the business.

Speaking of the Archbishop, we may observe, that it was in the course of this year, that his new edition of the Holy Bible, commonly called the *Bishops'*



*Bible*, came forth ; it was so called, as we may conclude, from the circumstances of the Bishops being chiefly concerned in the preparation of it ; it was adorned with maps, arms, and portraits ; the arms of Lord Burghley appearing in the map of Canaan, prefixed to the book of Genesis, and before the book of Psalms, where is also a portrait of him, in his gown and furs, and holding in his left hand a Hebrew psalter open, with his motto *COR UNUM ET VIA UNA* on the chapiters of the pillars between which he stands. A full account of this valuable publication, the second large Church Bible in the English language, may be seen in Strype's *Life of the Archbishop*, b. iv. ch. xx. One of the persons employed by the Archbishop, to compare the translation with the original, was *Laurence* ; " a man in those times," says Strype, " of great fame for his knowledge of the Greek language, and who read Greek to the Lady *Cecil*, afterwards Baroness *Burghley*, the Treasurer's Lady, of whom the said *Laurence* testified, that she equalled, if not overmatched, any of the same profession in that language."—*Laurence's* notes of errors in the translation may be seen in the Appendix to *Parker's Life*, No. lxxxv.

We must here take leave to introduce a long passage from Strype's *Life of Archbishop Parker*, so immediately relating to Lord Burghley and the town of Stamford, as not reasonably to be omitted.

" The latter end of this year several families of Protestant exiles, and natives for the most part of the Low Countries, were about transporting themselves out of London to Stamford in Lincolnshire, there to live and follow their callings ; and this by the motion of Lord Burghley, to whom the town chiefly belonged, well knowing what good profit and benefit might redound unto the place and country, by the trades and business these men should bring along with them, by taking off the wools at a good price, and encouraging the sowing of flax and hemp, improving land and such like ; for they were for the most part weavers of such sorts of cloths as were not yet wove and made (or very rarely) in England, as bays, and says, and stammets, fustians, carpets, linsey woolseys, fringes, tapestry, silks, and velvets, figured and unfigured linen : there were also among them dyers, rope-makers, hatters, makers of coffers, knives, locks, workers in steel and copper, and the like, after the fashion of Nurenburg in Germany. For the bringing this motion to perfection, *Isbrand Balkius* their minister, and *Casper Vosbergius*, in the name of the rest, put up their petition to Lord Burghley,\*

\* This petition, addressed "*Illustri ac generoso Domino D. a Burghley Mæcenati observandissimo*," may be seen in the Appendix to Strype's *Parker*, No. lxxii. with the articles, ten in number, following it, No. lxxiii.

whom they called their Mæcenæ, to obtain certain liberties and privileges from the Queen, to settle themselves and their families at Stamford ; to have a church to worship God in, in their own way, without disturbance ; to have a liberty to set up their trades, and to buy and sell, and to plant also and sow, and follow husbandry for their necessary subsistence, to make shoes, and garments, and hose, and to bake, brew, and exercise the occupations of carpenters, joiners, &c. for and among themselves—and to appoint seven men to settle any controversies and disputes that might arise.”

We need only add that the establishment of this Congregation and Manufacture took place as proposed, under the auspices of Lord Burghley, and continued a great while at Stamford.

It remains only to give an account of the Queen’s progresses this year.—Lord Burghley being a constant attendant, and having besides often to receive her Majesty at his own seat in Hertfordshire.

It was in the month of July that the Queen began her summer progress, 1572. and she appears to have passed first into Essex, to Havering Bower, belonging to her Lord High Chamberlain, Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, who not many months afterwards, was married, as we have already related, to Anne, daughter of Lord Burghley.

From Havering Bower she appears to have gone for three days to Theobalds, the seat of Lord Burghley, whose short memorandum of what was esteemed so great an honour, deserves to be copied. “July 22, 1572, the Queen’s Majesty was at *Theobalds*.”—This however was comparatively but a very short visit to that celebrated place ; as we shall see hereafter. From Theobalds she went to Gorhambury the seat of the Lord Keeper Bacon, brother-in-law to the Lord Treasurer, and from thence to Dunstable and Woburn, the seat of the Earl of Bedford. On the 12th of August her Majesty was at Warwick, being met on her way thither by the members of the Corporation, and addressed while in her carriage, by the Recorder in a *long* speech, after the fashion of the times ; to be seen in Nichols.\* The Lady of Warwick being in the coach with her Majesty, and many Lords and Ladies in attendance, particularly the Lord *Burghley*, High Treasurer, the Earls of Sussex, Oxford, Rutland, Huntingdon, Warwick and Leicester, Lord Howard of Effingham, and divers other Lords, Ladies, Bishops,

\* The account given in this speech of the *town*, and *Earls*, of Warwick, is very curious. A copy of verses presented by the Preacher of Warwick, was so composed, as to produce, from the initial and final letters, the following words, *Tu Elisabeta viro nubis, o mater eris*.—A strange conceit, but applicable to the wishes of a great part of her Majesty’s subjects.

and Gentlemen.—From Warwick she went to Kenilworth, leaving her household and train behind ; and stayed there from Wednesday morning till Saturday night, when she returned to Warwick ; at Kenilworth she is said to have been entertained with many princely sports, and on the Monday following she returned there again ;\* passing her time between Kenilworth and Warwick, till the 26th of August, when she went forward to Lord Compton's, at Compton in the county of Warwick ; from Lord Compton's her Majesty went to Berkeley Castle [Lord Berkeley's], and thence to her own palace at Woodstock ; where she appears to have received the account of the massacre at Paris. From Woodstock she went to Reading, and thence to Windsor, where her progress terminated on the 22d day of September, in which month she fell ill of the small-pox, but quickly recovered from it. Her Christmas the Queen kept at Hampton Court, from whence the Secretary, Sir Thomas Smith, wrote to a friend, " If ye would know what we do here, we play at tables, dance, and keep Christmas ;" which Strype, in his *Life of Sir Thomas*, conceives to have been a secret lash at the Court, for their carelessness at such a dangerous time.

\* Nichols's account, taken from the *Black Book* of Warwick, has a curious incident in it of some *Court Scandal*, communicated on the road to the Lord Treasurer, but the particulars of which do not appear.

END OF VOL. II.















